

# NIŚVĀSAMUKHATATTVAŚAMHITĀ

A PREFACE TO THE EARLIEST SURVIVING ŚAIVA TANTRA

(ON NON-TANTRIC ŚAIVISM AT THE DAWN OF THE  
MANTRAMĀRGA)

CRITICAL EDITION, WITH INTRODUCTION & ANNOTATED TRANSLATION

AND AN APPENDIX CONTAINING ŚIVADHARMASAṄGRAHA 5–9

The French Institute of Pondicherry (IFP), UMIFRE 21 CNRS-MAE, is a financially autonomous institution under the joint supervision of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MAE) and the French National Centre of Scientific Research (CNRS). It is a part of the network of 27 research centres under this Ministry. It also forms part of the research unit 3330 “Savoirs et Mondes Indiens” of the CNRS, along with the Centre de Sciences Humaines (CSH) in New Delhi. It fulfils its missions of research, expertise and training in Human and Social Sciences and Ecology in South Asia. It works particularly in the fields of Indian cultural knowledge and heritage (Sanskrit language and literature, history of religions, Tamil studies...), contemporary social dynamics and the natural ecosystems of South India.

*L’Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP), UMIFRE 21 CNRS-MAE, est un établissement à autonomie financière sous la double tutelle du Ministère français des Affaires Etrangères (MAE) et du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS). Il est partie intégrante du réseau des 27 centres de recherche de ce Ministère. Avec le Centre de Sciences Humaines (CSH) à New Delhi, il forme l’USR 3330 du CNRS « Savoirs et Mondes Indiens ». Il remplit des missions de recherche, d’expertise et de formation en Sciences Humaines et Sociales et en Ecologie en Asie du Sud. Il s’intéresse particulièrement aux savoirs et patrimoines culturels indiens (langue et littérature sanskrite, histoire des religions, études tamoules...), aux dynamiques sociales contemporaines, et aux écosystèmes naturels de l’Inde du Sud.*

French Institute of Pondicherry, 11, St. Louis Street, P.B. 33, Pondicherry—605001, India

Tel: (413) 2231600, Email: ifpdir@ifpindia.org

Website: <http://www.ifpindia.org>



The mission of The French School of Asian Studies (EFEO), founded in 1900 in Hanoi and today under the aegis of the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research, is to study the classical civilizations of Asia. Stretching from India, in the West, across the whole of South-East Asia to China and Japan, the EFEO’s research areas cover most of the societies which have been ‘Indianised’ or ‘Sinicised’ over the course of history. A network of international scholars working at the EFEO’s seventeen centres and branch offices, which are spread across twelve Asian countries, has been essential in the development of the School’s research programme. Interdisciplinary projects bring together leading scholars in the fields of anthropology, archaeology, history, philology, and religious studies. In Pondicherry, the projects of the EFEO focus mainly on classical Indology: Sanskrit, Old Tamil, History, and History of art and of religions.

*L’École française d’Extrême-Orient (EFEO), fondée en 1900 à Hanoï, est un établissement relevant du ministère français de l’Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche dont la mission scientifique est l’étude des civilisations classiques de l’Asie. Son champ de recherches s’étend de l’Inde à la Chine et au Japon et, englobant l’ensemble du Sud-Est asiatique, comprend la plupart des sociétés qui furent indianisées ou sinisées au cours de l’histoire. Autour de ses dix-sept centres et antennes, installés dans douze pays d’Asie, se sont constitués des réseaux de chercheurs locaux et internationaux sur lesquels l’École a pu s’appuyer pour construire son essor. L’EFEO aborde l’Asie par des recherches pluridisciplinaires et comparatistes, associant l’archéologie, l’histoire, l’anthropologie, la philologie, et les sciences religieuses. À Pondichéry, les projets de l’EFEO portent essentiellement sur l’« indologie » classique : sanskrit, tamoul ancien, histoire, histoire de l’art et des religions.*

École française d’Extrême-Orient,  
22, avenue du Président Wilson,  
75116 Paris, France.

Tel: (33) 1 53 70 18 60

Website: <http://www.efeo.fr/>

Pondicherry Centre of the EFEO  
16 & 19, Dumas Street,  
Pondicherry—605 001, India.

Tel: (91) (413) 2334539/2332504

Email: [administration@efeo-pondicherry.org](mailto:administration@efeo-pondicherry.org)

### THE EARLY TANTRA SERIES

Tantric scriptures form the basis of almost all the various theistic schools of theology and ritual in post-Vedic India, as well as of a major strand of Buddhism (Vajrayāna). Among these schools, those centred on the Hindu deities Śiva and Viṣṇu spread well beyond the Indian subcontinent to Kambuja (Cambodia/Laos/Thailand), Champa (Vietnam) and Indonesia, while Buddhist tantrism quickly became pan-Asian.

With this mini-series, launched within the ‘Collection Indologie’, we are releasing some of the fruits of a Franco-German project funded from 2008 to 2011 by the *Agence Nationale pour la Recherche* and the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*. The series takes its name from the project’s title: ‘Early Tantra: Discovering the interrelationships and common ritual syntax of the Śaiva, Buddhist, Vaiṣṇava and Saura traditions’. Our aim was to study the interrelationships between the tantric traditions on the basis of fundamental source-material, which we would edit and publish for the first time. For this we made use of some of the exceptionally rich manuscript resources gathered in the twentieth century and studied by German and French research institutes at opposite poles of the sub-continent.

In recent centuries, the Tamil-speaking South is the only area where a vast corpus of Sanskrit texts of what was long the dominant school of tantric Śaivism continued being copied and so transmitted to the present day. So when, in 1956, Jean Filliozat secured a foothold in Pondicherry for French indological research, he created an ideal institutional base for the study of a forgotten chapter in the religious history of Asia. Gradually, the largest specialised manuscript collection of texts relating to the Śaiva Siddhānta was amassed, recognised in 2005 by UNESCO as a “Memory of the World” collection: *The Śaiva Manuscripts of Pondicherry*.

At the other end of the subcontinent, the cool climate of Nepal has preserved ancient manuscripts of texts of virtually every branch of Indian learning. Much of the early history of tantrism is thus preserved in the vast archive of Nepalese manuscripts microfilmed over more than three decades by the *Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project* (NGMPP), then partly catalogued by the *Nepalese German Manuscript Cataloguing Project* (NGMCP), run from Hamburg and from the NGMCP’s base in Kathmandu, the Nepal Research Centre (NRC). One Nepalese treasure, also included, in 2013, in UNESCO’s register, formed the cornerstone of our project: the ninth-century manuscript of the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*.

The *Early Tantra Series* is not a closed collection: as well as the editions and translations promised as part of the ‘Early Tantra’ project, studies of numerous related works were inspired or further advanced during the project’s workshops.

TO DIWAKAR ACHARYA

GURU AND FRIEND

COLLECTION INDOLOGIE 145  
EARLY TANTRA SERIES 6

# NIŚVĀSAMUKHATATTVASAṂHITĀ

A PREFACE TO THE EARLIEST SURVIVING ŚAIVA TANTRA

(ON NON-TANTRIC ŚAIVISM AT THE DAWN OF THE  
MANTRAMĀRGA)

CRITICAL EDITION, WITH INTRODUCTION & ANNOTATED TRANSLATION  
AND AN APPENDIX CONTAINING ŚIVADHARMASAṄGRAHA 5–9

EDITED BY

NIRAJAN KAFLE

with a foreword by Dominic Goodall

INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE PONDICHÉRY  
ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT  
ASIEN-AFRIKA-INSTITUT, UNIVERSITÄT HAMBURG

Comité de rédaction / Editorial Board

Anne CASILE, Hugo DAVID, T. GANESAN, Dominic GOODALL, Frédéric LANDY

Comité Éditorial / Advisory Board

Diwakar ACHARYA (Kyoto University),  
Nalini BALBIR (Université de Paris III et École pratique des hautes études),  
Peter BISSCHOP (Leiden University),  
Eloïse BRAC DE LA PERRIÈRE (Université de Paris IV),  
Sylvain BROQUET (Université d'Aix-Marseille),  
Whitney COX (Chicago University),  
Richard DAVIS (Bard College, New York),  
Alexander DUBIANSKI (Moscow State University),  
Arlo GRIFFITHS (École française d'Extrême-Orient),  
François GROS (École pratique des hautes études, retired),  
Oskar von HINÜBER (University of Freiburg im Breisgau),  
Padma KAIMAL (Colgate University),  
Kei KATAOKA (Kyushu University),  
Vempati KUTUMBA SASTRY (Banaras Hindu University),  
Leslie ORR (Concordia University),  
Parul PANDYA DHAR (Delhi University),  
Aloka PARASHER-SEN (University of Hyderabad),  
V. SELVAKUMAR (Thanjavur University),  
Kesavan VELUTHAT (Delhi University, retired).

Comité de Lecture / Peer-review

Les éditeurs font appel à des spécialistes de leur choix pour l'évaluation des manuscrits soumis.

The publishers of the series call on experts of their choice for the evaluation of manuscripts submitted.

© Institut Français de Pondichéry, 2020 (ISBN 978-81-8470-237-8)

© École française d'Extrême-Orient, 2020 (ISBN 978 2 85539 240 0)

© Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Asien-Afrika-Institut,  
Universität Hamburg

Typeset by Nirajan KAFLE in Latin Modern and Velthuis' Devanāgarī, using ED-MAC, T<sub>E</sub>X and X<sub>Y</sub>L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X.

Cover design: Ink & Paper, Pondicherry.

Cover photo by Andrey KLEBANOV: detail of a coverboard from a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript of the *Śivadharmā* held in the National Archives, Kathmandu, NGMPP B 7/3, dated to 1170 CE, showing a *liṅga* of fire flanked by Brahmā and Viṣṇu.

Printed at the Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press, Pondicherry.

# Contents

<b>Foreword</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Preface</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>17</b>
Author, Origin, Date, and Title of the Text . . . . .	20
Author of the Text . . . . .	20
Place of Origin . . . . .	21
Date of the Text . . . . .	24
The Title of the Work . . . . .	27
The position of the <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> in the corpus of the <i>Niśvāsa</i> . . . . .	29
The <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> 's introduction of the Mantramārga through the 'Five Streams' . . . . .	32
The <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> as a preface to the Mantramārga . . . . .	44
The <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> : A Mirror to Early Śaivism . . . . .	46
The <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> as a precursor to 'Hinduism' . . . . .	51
Parallels and Borrowings . . . . .	53
Parallels with other Books of the <i>Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā</i> . . . . .	54
The <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> 's Borrowings from the <i>Pāśupatasūtra</i> . . . . .	66
The <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> 's Borrowings from the <i>Manusmṛti</i> . . . . .	74
The <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> and the <i>Śivadharmasāstra</i> . . . . .	81
Borrowings from the <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> by the <i>Śivadharmasaṅgraha</i> . . .	88
Extent and type of borrowing . . . . .	89
Additions in the <i>Śivadharmasaṅgraha</i> . . . . .	94
Grammatical Changes . . . . .	95
Regularisation of Compounds . . . . .	96
Syntactical Changes . . . . .	97
Alteration of Content . . . . .	97
Noteworthy Irregularities in the <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> . . . . .	99
Structural Overview and Summary of Content . . . . .	103
Chapter One . . . . .	104
Chapter Two . . . . .	106
Chapter Three . . . . .	108

Chapter Four . . . . .	111
Language of the <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> . . . . .	113
Morphology of Nominal Forms . . . . .	114
Compounds . . . . .	117
Morphology of the Verb . . . . .	118
<i>Sandhi</i> . . . . .	119
Hiatus-breakers . . . . .	120
Syntax . . . . .	120
Ordinal instead of Cardinal Numbers . . . . .	121
Other Irregular Numbers . . . . .	121
Unfamiliar Words . . . . .	121
<i>Aiśa</i> Forms Unattested Elsewhere . . . . .	122
Metre . . . . .	122
Manuscripts . . . . .	124
Sources for the <i>Niśvāsamukha</i> . . . . .	124
Sources for the <i>Śivadharmasaṅgraha</i> . . . . .	126
Editorial Policies . . . . .	128
Symbols and Abbreviations in the Critical Apparatus . . . . .	131
Sigla of the Manuscripts Used . . . . .	132
<b>Sanskrit Text</b>	<b>133</b>
<i>prathamah paṭalaḥ</i> . . . . .	135
<i>dvitīyah paṭalaḥ</i> . . . . .	162
<i>tr̥tīyah paṭalaḥ</i> . . . . .	181
<i>caturthah paṭalaḥ</i> . . . . .	210
<b>Translation</b>	<b>231</b>
Chapter One . . . . .	233
Chapter Two . . . . .	266
Chapter Three . . . . .	283
Chapter Four . . . . .	309
<b>Appendix</b>	<b>345</b>
Edition of <i>Śivadharmasaṅgraha</i> chapters 5–9 . . . . .	347
<b>Works Consulted</b>	<b>441</b>
<b>Index of Pādas</b>	<b>473</b>
<b>General Index</b>	<b>509</b>



## FOREWORD

I am delighted to have been asked by Nirajan KAFLE to furnish a foreword to this precious edition and translation of a text of very great interest for the history of Śaivism.

When Nirajan KAFLE first came to Pondicherry in 2007, at the suggestion of Diwakar ACHARYA, it was to participate in reading-sessions and to help preparing for the first workshop on the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*, an event that Alexis SANDERSON's presence made particularly inspiring to many, and that encouraged Harunaga ISAACSON and myself to launch the Franco-German 'Early Tantra' Project. Nirajan KAFLE's assistance was invaluable, for instance in helping Nibedita ROUT, R. SATHYANARAYANAN, S. A. S. SARMA and myself to complete an electronically searchable transcription of related materials, such as the *Niśvāsakārikā* and *Dikṣot-tara*. Once the 'Early Tantra' Project was launched, inviting Nirajan KAFLE to come for a longer stay and participate in the project by producing a doctorate in Pondicherry seemed a natural choice. That doctorate was eventually completed and examined at the University of Leiden some years later, under the guidance of Peter BISSCHOP, and has now resulted in the book that you hold in your hands.

I confess that when, towards the beginning of Nirajan KAFLE's doctoral studies, after some weeks of reading together, I asked him which part of the large *Niśvāsa*-corpus he wished to focus upon, I was surprised at his answer and not at once enthusiastic about his choice. From all the intriguing range of possible themes treated in the corpus transmitted in the ninth-century manuscript — yogic meditation, initiations, magical rites — it seemed to me strange that he should choose the introductory portion, the *Niśvāsamukha*. The exciting discoveries which that introductory portion had to offer had already, as it seemed to me, been drawn out of the text by SANDERSON's important article of 2006 on 'The Lākulas...' What remained seemed to be a screed of pronouncements about non-Mantramārga devotional practice that could surely be found in many a *Purāṇa*.

But of course I soon discovered that the devotional practices recorded by the *Niśvāsamukha* are in fact of considerable intrinsic interest — all the more so as they can be dated within a corpus whose relatively early place in time, while not particularly precise, is nonetheless rather more secure than that of most sections of most *Purāṇas*. Furthermore, I also came to realise that the *Niśvāsamukha* provides invaluable help in mapping the contours of the relations between four different traditions of early Śaivism. Those traditions are: firstly, that of the Pāñcārthika Pāśupatas, hitherto known to us principally from the *Pāśupatasūtra* and Kaundinya's commentary; secondly, another Atimārga school identified by SANDERSON (2006) as the Somasiddhānta, about whom we knew very little before; thirdly, the emerging Mantramārga, whose teachings are expounded in the other books transmitted in the same manuscript; and fourthly, the tradition of what might be called pre-Mantramārga "lay" practices that are reflected in the earliest layers of the corpus

of *Śivadharmā* texts. In short, it would be difficult to exaggerate how useful this primary source is for the history of the Śaiva religions.

An edition in this series of the *Niśvāsamukha* thus forms a bridge between one of the primary research areas in Pondicherry over the last sixty years, namely the Śaiva Siddhānta, and a newly emerging focus of research, the Śaivism of devotees who were not religious professionals, nor necessarily sectarian initiates.<sup>1</sup>

The Śaiva traditions have been hugely varied, encompassing antinomian practices that harnessed the power of transgressive sexual and charnel-ground rituals, as well as philosophically sophisticated defences of a range of both dualist and non-dualist theological positions. Recently, what has been most studied amongst the Sanskrit works reflecting these traditions, particularly in the last sixty years (and particularly in the French institutions of research in Pondicherry), is overwhelmingly the huge and fascinating literary corpus of doctrines and liturgies produced by an initiated elite of “professionals” whose professed aims were enjoyment of extraordinary powers (*bhoga*) and ultimate personal liberation characterised by the realisation of omniscience and omnipotence (*mokṣa*). These are arguably not the sorts of goals that one might expect to be those of a religious mainstream, and indeed the social dimensions of a large institutionalised religion seem to be absent from the earliest literature of the Mantramārga.<sup>2</sup> Over time, the social base of what came to be called the Śaiva Siddhānta appears gradually to have broadened, to the point where it claimed authority over the large South Indian temple-complexes

<sup>1</sup> One important body of non-sectarian Śaiva literature that has long been a focus of research in Pondicherry is that of the hymns of the *Tēvāram*, for they were long supposed in some sense to be works of the Śaivasiddhānta, even though this was certainly not how they were regarded in the period in which they were composed (GOODALL 2014: xxxiii). One day, a longer demonstration of this contention should be provided, showing for instance that many of the supposedly Saiddhāntika technical terms that occur in the *Tēvāram* are not in fact narrowly distinctive of the Śaiva Siddhānta (terms such as *pācam*, *pantam*, and even *cadācivam*). An important exception here is the use of a *caḥaḥi ceytu* by Sundarar, apparently as a synonym of the term *sakalīkaraṇa* in 7.65.5 (references to the hymns here follow SUBRAMANYA AIYAR, CHEVILLARD & SARMA 2007), which is indeed distinctive of the Mantramārga. Otherwise, one struggles to find distinctively Saiddhāntika theological or liturgical notions, or Śaiva terms deployed in contexts that imply a Saiddhāntika understanding of those terms. Furthermore, when Śaiva religious professionals are mentioned, for instance in descriptions of temple processions, they are often in mixed groups and no particular importance is accorded to followers of the Śaiva Siddhānta. In 4.20.3 (translated by TÖRZSÖK 2004: 15), for example, we find a mixture of followers of observances characterised by spreading matted locks (*viricātaiviratikaḥ*), brahmins (*antaṇar*), Śaivas (*caivar*), Pāśupatas (*pācupatar*) and Kāpālikas (*kapālikaḥ*). The Śaivas may be Saiddhāntikas, but they do not stand out from the list. Elsewhere, in similar passages, we find Śaivas and Pāśupatas together (1.66.4), or Mahāvratins alone (4.21.1), and Rudras (*uruttirarkaḥ*, in 2.29.4), who may be followers of the Atimārga (thus the suggestion of TÖRZSÖK 2004: 13, fn. 49). In other words, there seems to me nothing in this body of hymns to suggest a privileged position of the Śaiva Siddhānta in the socioreligious world that they reflect.

<sup>2</sup> See the section entitled ‘Archaism in the realm of social religion’ in the introduction to the edition of the earliest *sūtras* of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* (GOODALL, SANDERSON, ISAACSON et al. 2015: 47–66).

ringed with multiple enclosure walls that began to proliferate in the Cōla period, a phase reflected in the extensive twelfth- and post-twelfth-century corpus of South Indian Temple Āgamas, which appear intended to describe every aspect of the life of such temples as seen primarily from the perspective of the priests.<sup>3</sup> But this body of literature belongs to a much later period and seems in any case not to have spread its influence much beyond the Tamil-speaking South.

And yet there are older sources that give us a picture of what seems to have been a socially much broader lay Śaiva religiosity. And perhaps most important of these sources is the largely still unpublished body of Sanskrit works known as the *Śivadharm*-corpus, the works expounding the “Religion of Śiva”, produced between the sixth and ninth centuries CE. Here we find that ultimate liberation is presented as a more distant goal, as DE SIMINI explains (2016: 50):

The religion promoted by the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmotara* is thus mainly a religion of *bhukti* (‘enjoyment’), in which devotees strive to secure a very long afterlife in one of the celestial worlds, after which those who have generated the utmost merits can be reborn on Earth as powerful kings or wise Brahmins. Only in a future rebirth will they have the opportunity to become initiated, and will thus attain final emancipation (*mukti*) from the cycle of existence (*saṃsāra*).

Furthermore, we find that, instead of theology and liturgy, the principal focus is on public piety and generosity towards the religion, as DE SIMINI continues (2016: 5):

The main pillar of this worldly religion is the worship of Śiva in his aniconic representation of the *liṅga*—although the use of iconic forms is also well attested—and in the performance of gifts (*dāna*), either to support the community of initiated Śaiva yogins and teachers (*ācārya*), or in favour of other lay followers.

In what may be the first discussion of the *Śivadharm*-corpus in a work published in the Collection Indologie (GOODALL 1998: 375–376, fn. 616), it is implied that the *Śivadharm*-corpus was produced “for non-initiates” by an initiated elite. The tenth-century Kashmirian Saiddhāntika exegete Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha tells us in his *Kiraṇavṛtti* (on verses 11d–12 of chapter 6) that those incapable of following the intensive religious life entailed by a regular initiation into the Śaivasiddhānta — diseased persons, the elderly, women and such — may receive an initiation that will liberate them at death, but that will not bind them to the usually obligatory post-initiatory observances. With liberation guaranteed, what they do after initiation is soteriologically irrelevant, but he suggests that they may thereafter express their devotion to Śiva, the guru and Śiva’s devotees, either in a worldly way (*laukikena*

<sup>3</sup> For a relatively recent discussion touching on this development and this corpus, see GOODALL’s introduction to SATHYANARAYANAN 2015, in particular the section entitled ‘Trilocana and the South Indian Temple’ (pp. 37–48).

*rūpeṇa*),<sup>4</sup> or in a manner taught by the *Śivadharmā*. Rāmakaṇṭha's presentation had suggested to me that the *Śivadharmā*-corpus was diluted scripture deliberately produced by theologians who were knowingly generating an exoteric — and therefore necessarily only half-true — body of teachings, primarily for pious folk in need of religious encouragement, but unable, for whatever reason, to receive the one soteriologically effective remedy for the ills of *saṃsāra*, namely salvific *dīkṣā*.

Such a model now seems flatly implausible, for a start because the *Śivadharmasāstra* and *Śivadharmottara* contain numerous allusions that connect them to Atimārga religion (see DE SIMINI 2016:51ff), not to the Mantramārga. In other words, it seems now quite clear (*pace* Rāmakaṇṭha and GOODALL 1998) that the *Śivadharmasāstra* and *Śivadharmottara* were not deliberately produced as an ancillary bowdlerising scripture for the uplift or social control of pious non-initiates. The testimony of the *Niśvāsamukha*, which incorporates a lengthy account of the sorts of practices that those texts prescribe in its account of the religious context into which the Mantramārga was born, suggests that they reflect instead a vigorous independent tradition of devotion to Śiva.

The Pondicherry Centre of the EFEO is now a participating beneficiary of a five-year project funded by the European Research Council that has been awarded to Florinda DE SIMINI (« L'Orientale », Naples) to address this literature: 'Translocal Identities: The *Sivadharmā* and the Making of Regional Religious Traditions in Premodern South Asia' (ERC grant agreement n° 803624). This new *Śivadharmā* project, in which Nirajan KAFLE is also involved, aims to open up more of this primary source material to scholarship and to document better the huge spread of its influence across the Sanskrit cosmopolis (discernible primarily through epigraphs, translations, quotations, borrowings and commentaries). In so doing, it will inevitably also throw further light on the genesis of the complex nexus of ideas and practices that are called "Hinduism", as Nirajan KAFLE has done in this important volume.

Dominic Goodall,  
EFEO, Pondicherry

---

<sup>4</sup> In other words, in a manner congruent with the well recognised exoteric brahmanical sources of *dharma*, namely *śruti* and *smṛti*: see GOODALL 1998: 375, fn. 615.

## PREFACE

This work is one of the results of a larger, collaborative, three-year project on *Early Tantra* (2008-2010), co-funded by the Agence Nationale pour la Recherche and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG); it was jointly directed by Dominic GOODALL and Harunaga ISAACSON. The Japan Student Services Organization and the Jan Gonda Fund Foundation, in collaboration with the International Institute for Asian Studies, also supported my efforts to finalise the present work by providing scholarships of three months<sup>5</sup> and six months<sup>6</sup> respectively, allowing me to carry out research and finalize my doctoral dissertation in 2015.<sup>7</sup> Subsequently, in continuation of my previous research in the field of ‘early lay Śaivism’, I continued to carry out research in the subject area as part of the NWO project ‘From Universe of Viṣṇu to Universe of Śiva’, directed by Peter BISSCHOP, University of Leiden.<sup>8</sup> As a result, I had the opportunity to deepen, refine, and expand upon my initial findings to the degree that they reached the present format.

Were it not for Dominic GOODALL, this work would never have seen the light of day. First and foremost, I would therefore like to express my gratitude to him for having taught me what I know about Śaivism, for inviting me to Pondicherry to work with him, and, in particular, for sharing the results of his research—both published and unpublished. During our joint research sessions at the École française d’Extrême Orient, he analysed—with incredible attention to detail—the complete draft of this work, including the translation, offering decidedly beneficial corrections. I am extremely indebted to him for his innumerable suggestions and illuminating comments on all parts of the text. Meanwhile, it goes without saying that the author takes full responsibility for any errors which undoubtedly remain—be they hidden or apparent, and wish to invoke the reader’s leniency in this regard.

I also owe a great debt of gratitude to Peter C. BISSCHOP for accepting me as his doctoral student and for providing essential support of practical and administrative nature during my enrolment process at the university of Leiden. During my stay, he scrutinized my entire thesis and made many insightful observations that allowed me to improve it considerably. In particular, he kindly invested great efforts in helping me improve the structure and mode of argumentation of the introductory section of this volume, despite his manifold teaching and research obligations.

I am very grateful to Diwakar ACHARYA for long years of teaching the Sanskrit language, for reading the entirety of the precursor to this work, and for inviting me to his home with heart-warming frequency during my stay at Kyoto. He too shared both published and unpublished work, for which I remain thankful to this

---

<sup>5</sup> The scholarship spanned the period from March to May, 2013.

<sup>6</sup> Financial support was granted from September 2014 to February 2015.

<sup>7</sup> The title of the thesis is ‘The *Niśvāsamukha*, the introductory book of the *Niśvāsātattva-saṃhitā*: critical edition, with an introduction and annotated translation appended by *Śiva-dharmasaṅgraha* 5–9’.

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.nwo.nl/onderzoek-en-resultaten/onderzoeksprojecten/i/44/13544.html>

day. Without his help a great number of seemingly intractable textual difficulties would have remained unresolved.

I would also like to thank Yuko YOKOCHI and Somdev VASUDEVA for proposing constructive changes to the text while ameliorating it during my three-month stay at Kyoto.

My sincere thanks also go to Bhim KANDEL and Kashinath NYUPANE, for having taught me Sanskrit over the years with unfailing energy. Furthermore, I am grateful to Harunaga ISAACSON for his insightful suggestions at different stages of this project. I would also like to express my gratitude to Sasha LUBOTSKY, who kindly took the time to read the language-section of this work and share his incisive observations regarding grammatical analysis.

Marion RASTELLI (IKGA, University of Vienna) and Timothy LUBIN (Washington and Lee University), originally anonymous reviewers of a mature draft of this work submitted for evaluation, have kindly revealed their identities. Although errors and shortcomings without doubt remain, their generosity and specialist knowledge has improved away many structural and factual shortcomings of the earlier draft, for which kind support I would like to express my gratitude.

I thank in particular my friends Esther-Maria GUGGENMOS, Rajan KHATIWODA Nina MIRNIG, Florinda DE SIMINI, Marco FRANCESCHINI, Giovanni CIOTTI, Daniele CUNEO and Andrey KLEBANOV for their strong encouragement throughout, and also for providing me with relevant materials.

I also owe a debt of gratitude to my friends Ven. GYALTEN Jigdre, Philip PIERCE, Mary PREMILA, Thomas Fulton O’GARA, Suganya ANANDAKICHENIN, Leah COMEAU and Timothy C. CAHILL for proofreading sections of this study at different stages of its development and offering their valuable feedback.

I thank the Pondicherry Centre of the EFEO and its librarian Shanty RAYAPOULLÉ, who was most helpful in the provision of primary and secondary sources; the French Institute of Pondicherry and its librarian NARENDRAN, who showed the same generosity; the National Archives of Kathmandu, and the Nepalese-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project.

I would also like to thank the group of scholars who participated in the *Workshop on Early Śaivism: the Testimony of the Nīśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* held in 2007 at the EFEO in Pondicherry, during which we analysed and debated verses 1.1 to 1.88. Among them were: Alexis SANDERSON, Dominic GOODALL, Harunaga ISAACSON, Diwakar ACHARYA, Peter BISSCHOP, Arlo GRIFFITHS, Jun TAKASHIMA, Kei KATAOKA, Anil Kumar D. ACHARYA, Nina MIRNIG, Nibedita ROUT, Andrea ACRI, R. SATHYANARAYANAN and S.A.S. SARMA.

For the preparation of this work, I have drawn on digital materials from the following electronic resources:

1. Muktabodha Indological Research Institute
2. Digital Library of India
3. GRETEL (Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indic Languages).





# Introduction

A sole 9<sup>th</sup>-century<sup>9</sup> Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript preserved in the National Archives, Kathmandu (NAK) transmits what appears to be the oldest surviving Śaiva tantra, called the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. This manuscript consists of five separate books—in order of appearance within the manuscript, these are the *Niśvāsamukha*, the *Mūlasūtra*, the *Uttarasūtra*, the *Nayasūtra* and the *Guhyasūtra*.<sup>10</sup> Various scholars have referred to this manuscript in the past, beginning with ŚĀSTRĪ (1905: lxxvii, 137–140), BAGCHI (1929: 757 ff.), GOUDRIAAN & GUPTA (1981: 33–36), SANDERSON (2006: 152), GOODALL & ISAACSON (2007: 4) and, most recently, GOODALL et al. (2015: 103–108).

Since the *Niśvāsamukha* has not yet been published in full,<sup>11</sup> it is with great joy that we herewith present the first critical edition and annotated translation of the work. We also present an edition of five chapters—chapters five to nine—of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* as an appendix. These chapters are closely linked with the *Niśvāsamukha*,<sup>12</sup> provide a host of text-historically relevant information, and hence merit special attention. A critical edition and annotated translation (GOODALL et al. 2015) of the three books which together comprise the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*—i.e.

<sup>9</sup> For an analysis of the evidence relating to the likely date of composition of the text, the reader is referred to pp. 24 ff.

<sup>10</sup> In addition to the five books of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, a text called *Niśvāsakārikā* has been detected. This text contains a large section that is referred to as the *Dikṣottara*, presumably an originally separate Śaiva work (see GOODALL et al. 2015: 23–26). The *Niśvāsakārikā* is not contained in the Nepalese manuscript but survives independently in three South Indian transcripts preserved in the French Institute of Pondicherry (T. 17, T. 127 and T. 150). It is to be noted that *Guhyasūtra* 18.15 refers to a work called *Kārikā*, presumably a reference to the *Niśvāsakārikā*. Besides, there exists a Śaiva *pratiṣṭhā* text—the *Niśvāsākhyamahātāntra*—traced to a Nepalese manuscript (NGMPP reel number A 41/13), which, however, bears no apparent connection to the *Niśvāsa* corpus. As far as we are aware, these are the texts that have survived to date under the title *Niśvāsa*. From other Śaiva sources we learn that a number of other texts may have existed under this same title (GOODALL et al. 2015: 23–30). The existence of different works under the same title leads to the assumption that the *Niśvāsa* may have developed in the fashion of the *Kālottara*, undergoing more than one recension. (D. ACHARYA is to be credited for first advancing this theory; for the various recensions of the *Kālottara*, see GOODALL 2007: 125–127).

<sup>11</sup> SANDERSON 2006 contains extracts from the *Niśvāsamukha*.

<sup>12</sup> For more details, see the section ‘Borrowings from the *Niśvāsamukha* by the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*’ (p. 88).

the *Mūlasūtra*, the *Uttarasūtra*, and the *Nayasūtra*—has been published by Dominic GOODALL, Alexis SANDERSON and Harunaga ISAACSON in a joint effort, a process in which we have been involved as well.

The *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā* is consistently presented as one of the eighteen Rudratāntras in all the lists of the Mantramārgic (Saidhāntika) Śaiva canon.<sup>13</sup> This canon consists altogether of twenty-eight principal scriptures, falling into two categories: ten Śivabheda (Śiva-divisions) and eighteen Rudrabheda (Rudra-divisions), along with scriptures that claim to be sub-recensions (*upabheda*) of these.<sup>14</sup> All these scriptures, including sub-recensions, are works of authority for the Śaiva Siddhānta.<sup>15</sup> The *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā* is an important text for tracing the early history of tantric Śaivism: it may be the oldest surviving text of the ‘Mantramārga’ (the path of mantras), the term by which the *Niśvāsamukha* (4.132) refers to tantric Śaivism. The tantric tradition, or more specifically, “the scriptural revelations of the Śaiva mainstream” (SANDERSON 1988: 660), is believed to have developed in South Asia from about the 6<sup>th</sup> century CE.<sup>16</sup> This religious system presents itself as a superior and more powerful form of religion and promises supernatural powers (*bhukti*) and liberation (*mukti*) to its followers, who are encouraged to rely on the power of spells (*vidyā*, *mantra*), which in turn require initiation (GOODALL et al. 2015: 15). The *Niśvāsamukha*, in its four chapters, is devoted to relating the religious context in which the Mantramārga, purportedly the ‘highest stream of religion’, evolved.<sup>17</sup> The Mantramārga is thereupon taught in the subsequent four books of the *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā*. The *Niśvāsamukha* is the earliest extant source to present a five-fold framework known as the ‘Five Streams’. This framework envelops the entirety of the *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā* in a dialogue between Śiva and his consort Devī; the success of this scheme is reflected in the fact that subsequent early Śaiva treatises have adopted versions of this taxonomy for the framing of their own respective works.<sup>18</sup>

The ‘Five Streams’ (*pañca srotāḥ*) are subjected to a hierarchical stratification which, graded from ‘lowest’ to ‘highest’, comprise the following elements: the Laukika (worldly), Vaidika (vedic), Ādhyātmika (relating to the soul), Atimārga (transcendent), and Mantramārga streams. The *Niśvāsamukha* (= *Mukha*) functions both as a pithy summary of the first four streams, presented as exoteric tenet systems, and as a preface to the Mantramārga, which is to be expounded in the

<sup>13</sup> The reader is referred to GOODALL (2004: x ff.).

<sup>14</sup> An early list of these scriptures is already attested in the *Uttarasūtra* (1.23 ff.), the second book of the *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā*. For other lists, see the appendix to GOODALL (1998).

<sup>15</sup> SANDERSON (1988: 668).

<sup>16</sup> GOODALL & ISAACSON (2011: 122).

<sup>17</sup> Alexis SANDERSON (2006: 145) was the first Western scholar to introduce the term Mantramārga as a designation of tantric Śaivism. For a detailed discussion of tantric Śaivism, see SANDERSON (2006: 145ff).

<sup>18</sup> The framework of the *Niśvāsamukha* is apparent in the structural makeup of the *Paṇḍarāpārameśvara*, the *Svacchanda*, the *Mṛgendratāntra*, the *Jayadrathayāmala*, the *Pūrvakāmika*, and the *Śataratnasāṅgraha*.

ensuing volumes of the compilation. It is worth noting that the text of the *Niśvāsamukha* does not expound the ‘lower streams’ in equal measure—in fact, as we shall see, quite the contrary holds true. The first, Laukika, stream constitutes the largest part of the text and extends over the first three chapters in their entirety. This has the effect that subject-wise, the majority of the text is devoted to the lay Śaiva religion. As regards the sources of the Laukika section, parts of it have been traced to the *Manusmṛti*. There are some passages for which we find parallels in early *Purāṇas*, such as the *Skandapurāṇa*. Although we have singled out a diversity of other passages in the Laukika section that we suspect of likewise containing borrowed material, we have not yet been able to establish fully which of the external sources might have served as templates. The second, Vaidika ‘stream’, also, receives relatively thorough treatment, spanning forty-one verses (4.1–41), all of which are partly traceable to the *Manusmṛti*. The Ādhyātmika stream encompasses the teaching of Sāṅkhya (verses 4.42–48a) and Yoga (4.48b–69), yet receives altogether scant attention—in particular the Sāṅkhya system is related rather briefly. The Atimārga stream covers the system of the Pāśupatas at some length and is structurally divided into two subsections: the first is referred to as the Atyāśrama subsection, spanning from 4.70b to 88c; the second (4.88d–131d) provides an account of the teaching of the cosmological system of the Lokātīta, particularly as devised by the Kāpālikas.

Unlike the case of the first three streams, whose sources are only partially evident, it is apparent that the teaching of the Atyāśramins as contained in the first sub-section Atimārga constitutes, for the greatest part, a paraphrase of the *Pāśupatasūtra*.<sup>19</sup> That being the case, it is quite possible that, likewise, the second sub-section—elaborating upon the cosmological system of the Kāpālikas—might have drawn from an undefined Kāpālika source, quite likely a source which is no longer extant. As it stands, the fourth section, on the Atimārga, is exceptional insofar as it contains a considerable number of the precious few extant textual references that—through the act of borrowing—indirectly hail from the tradition of the Kāpālika-Pāśupatas. Since this material is—to the current state of our limited knowledge—not readily available elsewhere, it is, without doubt, an inordinately important source for further research on the otherwise sparsely known ‘proto-Śaiva’ Pāśupata-school.<sup>20</sup> The Mantramārga is not taught in the *Niśvāsamukha* itself,<sup>21</sup> which only prefaces it. However, the *Niśvāsamukha* makes passing references to the

<sup>19</sup> See SANDERSON 2006.

<sup>20</sup> The text of parts of this last section has already been published and discussed at length by SANDERSON in his 2006 article, ‘*The Lākulas*: New Evidence of a System Intermediate between Pāñcārthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism’.

<sup>21</sup> We do nevertheless learn, by way of the frame-story of the *Niśvāsamukha*, that supreme knowledge is only possible through initiation (*dīkṣā*), which destroys worldly existence (1.22). This initiation falls into two categories, that relating to *vidyā* ‘supernatural enjoyment’ on the one hand, and to *nirvāṇa* ‘final liberation’ (1.27–28) on the other. See GOODALL et al. 2015: 50–51.

Mantramārga in the inceptive and final sections of the work.<sup>22</sup> The frame narrative of the *Niśvāsamukha* thus finally presents us the Mantramārga teaching in relation to the teachings of the Laukika, Vedic, Ādhyātmika and the Atimārga systems. However, it is expounded, in profound detail, in the ensuing volumes of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. One of the most noteworthy characteristics of the Mantramārga as presented in the *Mūlasūtra*, the *Uttarasūtra*, the *Nayasūtra* and the *Guhyasūtra*, is that it contains no antecedent parallels that we have been able to trace. It therefore comprises the oldest surviving exposition of the Mantramārga amongst all presently known textual sources.

Concerning the typology of the *Niśvāsamukha*'s content, as well as that of the other books of the *Niśvāsa*, two distinct types of teachings become discernible. While the former presents non-tantric traditions, the latter is devoted to tantric Śaivism, which, as we have briefly mentioned above, requires initiation. Given this discrepancy, it is worth noting that they all are contained in a single manuscript. This is indeed a unique feature in the textual history of the early Śaiva tradition—none of the other pre-10<sup>th</sup>-century canonic Śaiva scriptures, such as the *Kiraṇa*, the non-eclectic and eclectic versions of the *Kālottara*, and the *Svāyaṃbhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha*, commences with non-tantric content. Thus, the *Niśvāsamukha*, as the opening book of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, is unique not only in the context of the *Niśvāsa*, but also with regards to the larger history of early Mantramārga Śaivism. Judging from textual indicators that will emerge in more detail as the present study progresses, it appears that the *Niśvāsamukha* was likely composed in order to introduce the Mantramārga to other major 'Hindu' traditions,<sup>23</sup> including branches of Śaivism. We suppose that the tradition of Śaiva tantra had already developed a clear identity distinct from that of other Śaiva traditions. Now, for the first time, the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* expends effort to associate tantric Śaivism with other contemporaneous *mārgas* (paths) of mainstream 'Hindu' traditions—perhaps coining the term 'Mantramārga' in the process. Thus, it may well have been composed in partial subservience to an effort to provide a point of connection between Mantramārga Śaivism and the religious communities it primarily interacted with. Hence it appears quite likely that the *Niśvāsamukha* played a noteworthy part in introducing tantric Śaivism to the diverse Hindu communities during the early stages of the history of Śaivism.

## Author, Origin, Date, and Title of the Text

### Author of the Text

Although we do not know who the author of the compendium might be, we can nevertheless make a number of relevant, corroborated hypotheses, based on the

<sup>22</sup> These are 1.27, 1.56, 4.132, 4.134 and 4.135.

<sup>23</sup> We are here wielding the term 'Hindu' in the broader sense of the word.

9<sup>th</sup>-century manuscript of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* which we have used for this publication. The manuscript contains the oldest extant version of the *Niśvāsamukha*<sup>24</sup> and is written by a singular scribe who presents the five individual volumes in a format which suggests that they form a coherent unit, that of the *Niśvāsa*-‘compendium’. The way of presentation of the individual teachings therein may well be indicative of the milieu from which the author of the text hailed, clearly a preponderantly Śaiva background.

### Place of Origin

It is, at present, nigh-on-impossible to ascertain, beyond doubt, where and under what circumstances the *Niśvāsamukha* was composed. Nevertheless, we can draw on rudimentary geographical textual evidence: the toponyms Naimiṣaraṇya ‘Naimiṣa forest’ (1.2, 1.5) and Devadāruvana ‘pine forest’ (1.11), for example,<sup>25</sup> are in all likelihood situated in the northern part of India. Peter BISSCHOP has offered the plausible suggestion that the Naimiṣa forest may have been situated on the bank of the river Gomatī, in what nowadays is the region of Uttar Pradesh.<sup>26</sup> Although we do not know the exact location of the Devadāruvana, BISSCHOP,<sup>27</sup> pointing to the evidence of the *Skandapurāṇa*, suggests that this place is probably situated somewhere in the region of the Himavat, the ‘snow[capped] mountains.’<sup>28</sup>

Besides these two illustrious woodland areas, the *Niśvāsamukha* makes mention of ‘Mahālaya’ (situated in the Himālayan region) (3.27) and ‘Kedāra’ (3.28), known to be located in modern-day Uttarakhand. Note that all of the aforementioned places are renowned, well-attested holy sites. Textually, this is borne out by the description of the Mahālaya as innately brimming with soteriological benefits available to anyone willing to frequent it:

*mahāpralayasthāyī ca sraṣṭānugrahaḥ kārakaḥ |*  
*darśanād eva gacchante padan divyaṃ mahālaye || 3.27 ||*

He who stands in Mahāpralaya (*mahāpralayasthāyī*)<sup>29</sup> [is] the creator and agent of grace; from merely (*eva*) seeing him [=Śiva] in [the sacred site of] Mahālaya, people will attain (*gacchante*) [in the next life] a celestial state of being.

<sup>24</sup> Note that the issue regarding the precise title of the work is somewhat complex, as we shall further investigate from p. 27 ff. We have opted here to refer to the work by the provisional title ‘*Niśvāsamukha*’.

<sup>25</sup> For a more elaborate discussion, consult p. 45.

<sup>26</sup> See BISSCHOP (2006: 217).

<sup>27</sup> BISSCHOP (2006: 255).

<sup>28</sup> BISSCHOP (2006a: 195) explains: “Most of the Purāṇic sources agree that it is a Himalayan mountain.”

<sup>29</sup> Perhaps this is to be understood in two ways: ‘he who remains [even] in a period of total resorption [of the universe]’ and ‘he who stands in [the sacred site called] Mahā(pra)laya’.

Mahālaya is the summit of the Himavat where Mahādeva, according to Purāṇic traditions, planted his foot-print, for which reason this location had become one of the holiest places for the Śaivas of ancient times.<sup>30</sup> Although the exact location of Mahālaya remains obscure, it is most likely located in the Himālayas.

Likewise, the fame of Kedāra as a worthy pilgrimage site is reflected in our text by its presentation as a special place infused with extraordinary features.<sup>31</sup> As shall be shown in more detail below,<sup>32</sup> it is stated that by dying in the vicinity of any site of the *pañcāṣṭaka*, a group of forty pilgrimage places, one penetrates the shell of the egg of Brahmā and ascends to the world associated with the site of one's demise; one will not be reborn in this world. Moreover, by merely drinking water from the sacred site of Kedāra one can obtain a result identical to the fruit of attaining the five divine sets of eight sacred places. Kedāra also appears in *Guhyasūtra* 7.115, and the elaborate legend of its origin and significance is recounted in chapter 16 of the *Guhyasūtra*.<sup>33</sup>

What is striking regarding Kardamāla is that, although Kardamāla is a minor, regional holy site, fit for the performance of bath rituals,<sup>34</sup> it is here mentioned as being amongst much more famous places for bathing.<sup>35</sup> If the passage is not borrowed from (an) earlier source(s), this would imply that the author treats it as if it were of equal standing to the towering, famed hallmarks of sacred geography. To our mind, this considerably strengthens the importance of Kardamāla as an indication of the provenance of our text, since its relatively limited renown suggests that the author, in all likelihood, must have been intimately acquainted with that area—otherwise he would have scarcely been aware of its existence.

In sum, Peter BISSCHOP plausibly concludes that the evidence culled from the list of toponyms suggests that the place of origin where the *Niśvāsamukha* was

<sup>30</sup> BISSCHOP 2006: 66.

<sup>31</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* 3.28a–29a.

<sup>32</sup> See p. 62.

<sup>33</sup> For the full treatment of Kedāra, see p. 63 onwards.

<sup>34</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* 3.12–13 reads:

*śoṇapuṣkaralohitye mānase sindhusāgare |*  
*brahmāvartte karddamāle snātvā ca lavaṇodadhau || 3.12 ||*  
*sarvapaṇḍitāḥ pūjāyetaḥ pitṛdevāṃś ca pūjāyetaḥ |*

Having bathed in the Śoṇa [river], Puṣkara [lake] or Lohitya [river], in [lake] Mānasa, in the place where the Indus, meets the ocean or in Brahmāvartta, or Kardamāla or in the salty ocean, one [becomes] free from all sins [and] one should [then] worship one's ancestors and the gods.

<sup>35</sup> Peter BISSCHOP, during the second International Workshop on Early Tantra, July 2009, Pondicherry, whilst presenting a paper on 'Purāṇic Topography in the Niśvāsa', suggested that this location may have had some connection with the Pāśupatas.

composed could be narrowed down to a stretch of land located between the Himavat and modern-day Gujarat.<sup>36</sup>

Let us investigate, somewhat more closely, the list of forty pilgrimage sites briefly referred to above. These are known as the *pañcāṣṭaka*, “the group of five ogdoads”.<sup>37</sup> In all likelihood, the *Niśvāsamukha* simply adopted this list of ‘five sets of eight’ *pañcāṣṭaka* from an earlier source,<sup>38</sup> in which case its own origin need not have anything to do with the list. We cannot, thus, take the list as evidence to locate the origin of the text. In addition, we encounter a list of rivers in *Niśvāsamukha* 3.2–8. This list also cannot be taken as evidence for the location of the origin of the text, as the *Niśvāsamukha* once again may have borrowed it from some earlier source, since lists of rivers appear in a vast range of texts.

The Prākṛtic words in the text might serve as a further, although limited, indicator of its origin. The text uses Prākṛtic vowels, such as *sāyojya* for *sāyujya*, in many a case.<sup>39</sup> Similarly, it records a further Prākṛtic vowel, *vāgeśyām* for *vāgīśvāryām* in 4.95a and 4.126c. There are some more conspicuous instances of Prākṛtic influence in the *Niśvāsamukha*. For example, the omission of the final *t* in optatives; and word formations particular to the language, for example *catālīśa*.<sup>40</sup> Such Prākṛtic forms once again invite the conclusion that the language employed in these instances is more likely indicative of a northern than a southern origin.<sup>41</sup> If the text had a more southern origin, we would expect other characteristic types of deviations from standard Sanskrit: masculine nouns, for instance, might be treated as neuter in gender; Prākṛtisms like *catālīśa* would be rare. Prākṛtic phonetic shifts are much less likely to be found in the non-standard Sanskrit written in Dravidian-language-speaking areas, in which Prākṛits were not spoken. All in all, we can conclude that a North Indian origin of the text appears most plausible.

<sup>36</sup> During the ‘Early Tantra’ Workshop, July 2009, at Pondicherry, Peter BISSCHOP showed how the presentation of the *śrāddha*-rites listed in the *Matsyapurāṇa* (22.77) contains evidence for this hypothesis. Likewise, Peter BISSCHOP referred to the *Prabhāsakhandha* (3.53) of the *Skandapurāṇa*, as well as to extracts from the *Viṣṇudharma* (36.13) professing Kardamāla to be a pilgrimage site consecrated especially for Viṣṇu’s incarnation as a boar (*varāha*). Following Peter BISSCHOP’s lead, we have found, moreover, that the same connection between Kardamāla and the *varāha*-incarnation of Viṣṇu is made in the *Padmapurāṇa* (170.6,7,10). This indicates that Kardamāla—about which little else is known—must have been a significant place of pilgrimage for both Vaiṣṇavites and Śaivas. In the *Nārada-purāṇa*, Kardamāla appears in two distinct contexts: (a) as a pilgrimage site of Śaiva interest (2.70:79 and 1.104:189); (b) as a place for performing the ancestral (*śrāddha*) rites (2.47:38). The *śrāddha*-context, as noted above, has been traced already by Peter BISSCHOP in the *Matsyapurāṇa*.

<sup>37</sup> Literally ‘five [sets] of eight’, the term has been translated as “the group of five ogdoads” by GOODALL (2004: 15, fn. 617). For a detailed treatment on the *pañcāṣṭaka* see GOODALL 2004: 315, BISSCHOP 2006: 27–37 and TAK2 s.v. *guhyaṣṭaka*.

<sup>38</sup> Despite our best efforts, we have not, as of yet, been able to trace the exact source.

<sup>39</sup> i.e. 1.41d, 1.79c, 1.79a, 1.83a, 1.86c, 1.89d, 1.91a, 1.94c, 1.96b, 1.99b, 2.18c, 3.29a, 3.86d, 3.145c, 3.150c, 3.191b and 4.87d.

<sup>40</sup> See the footnote on verse 4.107 for the form *catālīśa*.

<sup>41</sup> See also GOODALL et al. 2015: 72–73.

## Dating of the Text

The dating of the *Niśvāsamukha* remains an open question, since the sole manuscript of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* to survive has been copied from an unknown source in 9<sup>th</sup>-century Nepal. Although the manuscript is not dated, the script used to write it, ‘Licchavi’, is characteristic of the 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>42</sup> This provides us with a workable *terminus ante quem*. We note two instances where blank spaces purposefully feature in the manuscript—presumably in places where letters in the source-manuscript had become illegible or were missing to begin with.<sup>43</sup> If these gaps indeed reflect damage to the exemplar, this would mean that the scribe of the extant manuscript was working from a manuscript that was already worn—and therefore, most likely, not of recent origin.

GOODALL et al. (2015: 474) mention the possibility that the scribe of the manuscript failed to copy at least one folio of the source text. Were this indeed the case, this state of affairs would show that the manuscript we presently have recourse to is not the autograph, but a later witness. In other words, this would lead us to suppose that there existed at least one manuscript before the present one. This leads us to recalibrate the *terminus ante quem* of the original and settle it in the somewhat more distant past, and yet it is not possible to discern how much older the autograph would have been than the extant, 9<sup>th</sup>-century source that forms the basis of this study.

The dating of the other books of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, also, might serve as a valuable indicator for the time-frame of the *Niśvāsamukha*’s composition. GOODALL assumes that the whole corpus of the *Niśvāsa* was in all likelihood composed between the middle of the 5<sup>th</sup> and end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century. Hence for GOODALL et al (2015: 35), the text

... begins ... with the *Mūlasūtra* (c. 450-550 AD) and is completed with the *Niśvāsamukha* and *Guhyasūtra* probably by the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century. The pointers may be broadly grouped under the (partially overlapping) heads of palaeography; iconography; terminology; theology; social religion; and intertextuality (allusion within the *Niśvāsa* to other literature and allusions in other literature to the *Niśvāsa*).

BAKKER (2014: 9), however, prior to having had the possibility of consulting GOODALL et al.’s completed edition, expressed doubts about GOODALL’s dating of the *Mūlasūtra*, and instead believed it to be a century younger. He voiced the possibility that the *Mūlasūtra* and the *Skandapurāṇa* might have evolved in the same period.

However, at present, these deliberations contribute only in minor ways to our quest for the likely time-frame of the date of composition of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Had

<sup>42</sup> See GOODALL et al. 2015: 103 ff. For more details, see the discussion of the manuscript of the *Niśvāsa*, p. 124 ff. below.

<sup>43</sup> These are fol. 50<sup>v</sup>, line 4 and fol. 52<sup>r</sup>, line 4.



it been possible to establish the direction of borrowing between the *Guhyasūtra* and the *Niśvāsamukha*, we could have dated the *Niśvāsamukha* more precisely. Since evidence suggests<sup>44</sup> that the passage on the pilgrimage site of Kedāra, as rendered in the *Guhyasūtra* and the *Niśvāsamukha*, has very likely been composed by the same person, we can at least state that these two portions of text might have been composed at around the same time.

There are some parallels shared by the *Niśvāsamukha* and Purāṇic sources. For example, *Niśvāsamukha* 1.2ab (*aṣṭāśītisahasrāṇi ṛṣiṇām ūrdhvaretasām*) is paralleled in the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (1.7:180ab and 1.21:170cd) and the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (1.6:36ab). Similarly, *Niśvāsamukha* 1.126c–127b (*bukasya karavīrasya arkkasyon-mattakasya ca || caturṇṇām puṣpajātīnām sarvam āghrāti śaṅkaraḥ |*) is almost an exact parallel of *Skandapurāṇa* 28.31abcd (*caturṇṇām puṣpajātīnām gandham āghrāti śaṅkaraḥ || arkasya karavīrasya bilvasya ca bukasya ca |*). *Niśvāsamukha* 1.71ab (*śataṃ sanmārjane puṇyaṃ sahasram upalepane*) is closely paralleled by *Skandapurāṇa* 27.24ab (*saṃmārjanaṃ pañcaśataṃ sahasram upalepanam*). Although the first *pāda* is slightly different, we have found *sahasram upalepane/sahasram upalepanam* nowhere else except in these two texts and the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, which is known to have borrowed from the *Niśvāsamukha*.

It transpires that the parallels between the *Niśvāsamukha* and Purāṇic sources could help shed light on this issue if we could determine the direction of borrowing. With a clear indication of the definite source from which borrowing occurred yet missing, we cannot ascertain whether these verses were extracted from a shared, third source, or whether they found their way into the *Niśvāsamukha* and the Purāṇas by dint of having been widely current, ubiquitously recited verses that had no obvious singular source. Be that as it may, the *Niśvāsamukha*'s connection with these old Purāṇic sources may testify to the antiquity of the *Niśvāsamukha* if we are somehow able to substantiate an argument of contemporaneity—yet for this, we would need further corroborative evidence. Since we can neither ascertain the direction of borrowing of textual parallels, nor therefore the relative antiquity of the *Niśvāsamukha*, it would be ambitious to hypothesise about the absolute date of the *Niśvāsamukha* based on the above evidence alone.

There is, however, one important case of overlapping material in which the direction of borrowing can be determined. We have noted (pp. 88 ff.) that chapters 5–9 of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* and the text of the *Niśvāsamukha*<sup>45</sup> are closely related. Having examined this relation in greater detail, we have concluded that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* has been composed after the *Niśvāsamukha*, as we will explain below. A. K. ACHARYA, in a recent study (2009: 91) places the date of the

<sup>44</sup> The reader here is referred also to indicators presented on p. 63 ff.

<sup>45</sup> The introductory part of the first chapter and the section on *Ādhyātmika* and *Atimārga* (i.e. after verse 4.41) are not attested to in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.

*Śivadharmasaṅgraha* between the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries. This establishes that the pre-9<sup>th</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* predates the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.<sup>46</sup>

Another important locus of investigation is the *Pāśupatasūtra*, not least because the *Niśvāsamukha* (4.70c–88) paraphrases substantial sections of the work—which *ipso facto* must precede the *Niśvāsamukha*. If it could be established that Kaṇḍīya's commentary on the *Pāśupatasūtra* had any direct or indirect bearing on the *Niśvāsamukha*, a more precise dating would be possible. As we shall see in the course of this study,<sup>47</sup> there is indeed a considerable amount of additional information in the Pāśupata-section of the *Niśvāsamukha* to complement the content of the *Pāśupatasūtra*. Yet we cannot discern any manifest influence of Kaṇḍīya's 6<sup>th</sup>-century commentary to the *Pāśupatasūtra* reflected in these textual passages. One occasionally encounters borrowings from the *Manusmṛti*, both in the *Niśvāsamukha*'s Vedic section (4.2–41), which borrows from the third chapter of the *Manusmṛti*, and in the third chapter of the Laukika section of the *Niśvāsamukha*, where borrowings from Manu's chapters 2, 3, and 11 are traceable.<sup>48</sup>

Since OLIVELLE (2005: 24–25 ff.), on the basis of textual, historical, and numismatic evidence, dates the *Manusmṛti* to the 2<sup>nd</sup>–3<sup>rd</sup> century CE, his findings serve as a dependable *terminus post quem* for the dating of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

Let us scrutinize another relevant piece of evidence that is worthwhile investigating. It is likely that the *Svacchandatantra* was redacted after the *Niśvāsa* corpus, for the former borrows a large amount of text from the latter.<sup>49</sup> For example, SANDERSON (2006: 160), commenting on the account of Atimārga in the *Svacchandatantra*, writes,

... I propose that this explanation of the term Atimārga is not that of the *Svacchanda* itself, and that on the contrary his source exactly confirms the use of the *Niśvāsamukha*. This conclusion rests on *Svacchanda* 11.179c–184.

More recently (2009: 50), SANDERSON argued the following:

it is clear in my view that the *Svacchandatantra* was redacted after the formation of the *Niśvāsa* corpus, the *Tantrasadbhāva* after the *Svacchanda*, the *Kubjikāmatatantra* after the *Tantrasadbhāva*, the hexad of the *Jayadrathayāmala* after the *Kubjikāmatatantra*, and the remaining three hexads after the first.

On the basis of SANDERSON's arguments, it is evident that the *Niśvāsamukha* was composed before the *Svacchandatantra*. Since the date of the *Svacchandatantra* is an open question, the exact dating of the *Niśvāsamukha* remains a complicated issue, as pointed out by GOODALL et al. (2015: 22):

<sup>46</sup> See p. 24.

<sup>47</sup> Refer to p. 70.

<sup>48</sup> The Laukika section spans the first three chapters of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

<sup>49</sup> See SANDERSON (2006: 160 ff.).

More problematic is the relative date of the *Niśvāsamukha* in the corpus. Being professedly an introduction, it presupposes the existence of at least one *sūtra* for it to introduce, but because it does not discuss the subject matter of the *sūtras*, it is difficult to judge whether or not it was written when all of them were already in existence and constituted together a *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*.

In the end, we agree with the proposition of GOODALL et al. (2015: 35) that the *Niśvāsamukha* was redacted before the 8<sup>th</sup> century, probably some time during the seventh century. The precise date of the text, however, still needs further investigation.

### The Title of the Work

Exactly what is meant by the title of the work *Niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā* is difficult to assess clearly. Let us begin by trying to understand the meaning of the name *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, which is given as the title for the other four books of the *Niśvāsa* in the respective chapter colophons. This title seems to be less problematic in terms of the meaning concerned.

The *Uttarasūtra* (5.50–51) provides us with the etymology (*nirvacana*) of the *Niśvāsa* as follows:

*anadhītyatha niśvāsaṃ niśvasanti punaḥ punaḥ |*  
*adhītvā caiva niśvāsan na punar nniśvasanti te ||*  
*niśvāsa eva vikhyātas sarvatantrasamuccayaḥ |*  
*yaṃ jñātvā mucyate jantuḥ saṃsārabhavabandhanāt ||*

Now (*'tha*) those who do not study the *Niśvāsa* will go on sighing and sighing. And those who do study the *Niśvāsa*, they will not sigh again. [For this reason] it is known as the *Niśvāsa*, the compendium of all Tantras, on knowing which a creature will be released from the bondage of being in *saṃsāra*. GOODALL et al. (2015: 400)

On the basis of this passage we may render the title of the work as ‘compendium (*saṃhitā*) of the essence (*tattva*) of sighing (*niśvāsa*).’ The same work (5.53) uses the term *saṃhitā* to refer to the twenty-eight scriptures of the Śaiva canon:<sup>50</sup>

*aṣṭāvīṃśati yā proktā **saṃhitāḥ** parameṣṭhinā |*  
*teṣāṃ vyākhyā tu kartavyā upariṣṭāt samantataḥ ||*

<sup>50</sup> In the consecutive verse (5.54), this book, on its own, is identified as the *Niśvāsottarasamhitā*. It appears that the term here is likewise employed to refer to a tantric text rather than to a compendium of any kind—after all, it is referring to a single work: *śate dve daśa ślokanāṃ niśvāsottarasamhitā | ekaviṃśatkulān devī adhītya hy uddharīṣyati |*.

Of the twenty-eight scriptures taught by the Supreme One commentary will have to be offered (*kartavyā*) later (*upariṣṭāt*) in full (*samantataḥ*). GOODALL et al. (2015: 400)

In the *Mūlasūtra* (8.10), we come across the term *tattvasaṃhitā*, where it refers to this particular work:

*adhyāpayitvā etaṃ tu **tattvasaṃhitam** uttamam |  
buddhvā bhaktimayaṃ śiṣyam ācāryatve niyojayet ||*

Having taught him this supreme *tattvasaṃhitā*, if he realises that his disciple is full of devotion, he may appoint him as an *ācārya*. GOODALL et al. (2015: 330)

The same *sūtra* once again uses the same term in the same way in 8.20:

*samyag eṣa samākhyāto **tattvasaṃhita-m**-uttamaḥ |  
sagotrā eva mucyante yasya lekhye 'pi tiṣṭhati ||*

This supreme *tattvasaṃhitā* has been fully taught. All the members of one's *gotra* are liberated if one has it even [only] in [the form of] a manuscript. GOODALL et al. (2015: 335)

In the *Guhyasūtra* (1.4) the compound *tattvasaṃhitā* does not feature; however the shorter term *saṃhitā* is used in congruence with the above connotations.<sup>51</sup> It hence appears that these phrases feature in somewhat interchangeable contexts, which would downgrade the indicative significance of the component *tattva*; the omission of *tattva* appears to be attributable to metrical demands of versification. Furthermore, the use of the term *tattvasaṃhitā* to refer to a Śaiva tantra is also attested by Ṛṇḍayaśiva in a passage copied from the *Mṛgendratāntra*, where he refers to the text as the *Mṛgendratattvasaṃhitā*.<sup>52</sup> This suggests that in a Śaiva context, both words, namely *tattvasaṃhitā* and *saṃhitā*, may refer to a work of tantric nature. Taken in that sense, the conjunction of either term with the word *nīśvāsa*—which means ‘sighing’—could impel us to render the phrase *Nīśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* as ‘tantra of sighing’. In other words, it may refer to a tantra that originated from the sighing of Śiva, that is to say, a tantra that originated from the *speech* of Śiva.

At first blush, it seemed tricky to analyse *Nīśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā*, which might look as though it were intended to mean ‘compendium (*saṃhitā*) of the essence (*tattva*) of the sighing (*nīśvāsa*) face (*mukha*)’. But since it is the first book in the manuscript-compendium, it would be reasonable for it be referred to as the ‘face’ of the *Nīśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. For that sense, one might perhaps have expected instead

<sup>51</sup> For the full quotation and translation, the reader is referred to p. 29.

<sup>52</sup> Cambridge University Library, Add.2833, folio. 65<sup>v</sup>3–4: *mṛgeṇḍratat[t]vasaṃhitāyāṃ prāyaścittam likhyate*; fol. 67<sup>v</sup>4–5: *iti mṛgendratat[t]vasaṃhitāyāṃ prāyaścittapaṭalam iti* |.

the order *niśvāsa-tattva-saṃhitā-mukha*. But now that we know that *saṃhitā* and *tattvasaṃhitā* can be used interchangeably to refer to a ‘scripture’, we can mentally remove *tattvasaṃhitā* and understand *Niśvāsamukha* to mean ‘the [pre]face to the Niśvāsa’. We therefore follow SANDERSON (2006) in frequently referring to the book as the *Niśvāsamukha*. A complete translation of the complete title *Niśvāsamukha-tattvasaṃhitā* might be ‘the scripture that is the [pre]face to the [scripture called the] Sigh’.

## The position of the *Niśvāsamukha* in the corpus of the *Niśvāsa*

Delving further into the question regarding the *Niśvāsamukha*’s identity vis-à-vis the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, the following passage of the *Guhyasūtra* (1.1–5b) indicates that its author regards the *Niśvāsamukha* as an independent text in itself:

*upariṣṭāc caturthan tu sūtram ārabhyate punaḥ |*  
*tatra sūtratrayaṃ proktaṃ boddhavyaṃ anupūrvaśaḥ ||*  
*mūlañ cottarasūtraṃ [(((ca nayasūtraṃ tathaiva)))] ca |*  
*guhya-sūtrañ caturthan tu procyamānaṃ nibodha me ||*  
*tenaiva saha saṃyuktā saṃhitaikā prapaṭhyate |*<sup>53</sup>  
*niśvāseti ca nāmena*<sup>54</sup> *sampūrṇṇā tu tato bhavet ||*<sup>55</sup>  
*niśvāsasamhitā hy eṣā mukhena saha saṃyutā |*  
*pañcasrotās tu ye proktā mukhena parikīrtitāḥ ||*  
*tena yuktā bhavet puṣṭā sarvasūtreṣu paṭhyate |*

Now (*punaḥ*) below (*upariṣṭāt*) begins the fourth *sūtra*. Among those [*sūtras*], it should be understood that three have been taught in order: the *Mūla*, the *Uttarasūtra* and the *Nayasūtra*. Hear from me the *Guhya-sūtra*, the fourth, being taught. Joined with that [*sūtra*], one *saṃhitā* is promulgated: it then becomes complete, [known] by the name *Niśvāsa*. This, joined with the *Mukha*, is the *Niśvāsasamhitā*. The Five Streams that are spoken of are proclaimed by the *Mukha*. Joined with that, it becomes full: [the full *saṃhitā*] is taught in all [these] *sūtras*.<sup>56</sup> (GOODALL et al. 2015: 21)

The above-quoted passage indicates that the *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra* and *Nayasūtra* are the first three *sūtras*. The extract, moreover, informs us that the fourth *sūtra* is

<sup>53</sup> prapaṭhyate ] NK; prapadhyate W.

<sup>54</sup> niśvāseti ca nāmena ] NW; niśvāseti nāmena K.

<sup>55</sup> sampūrṇṇā tu tato bhavet ] NWK<sup>pc</sup>; sampūrṇṇam ca tato bhavet K<sup>ac</sup>.

<sup>56</sup> Given the cryptic nature of the above passage and the lack of further comparative materials, the translation quoted here should be regarded as tentative.

the *Guhyasūtra*. We can therefore safely assume that the former three were already in existence by the time the *Guhyasūtra* was composed.<sup>57</sup> This in turn suggests that the *Guhyasūtra* is the fourth book also with regards to the date of its composition.<sup>58</sup> In fact, in the section cited above, the term *anupūrvaśaḥ*, ‘in due order’, appears to be implying the relative chronology of the first three *sūtras*. The text mentions that the *Niśvāsa* is ‘complete’ (*saṃpūrṇā*), provided these four *sūtras* are joined. Note that the text neither refers to the *Mukha* (i.e. the *Niśvāsamukha*) as a *sūtra*, nor even as the fifth text of the compendium. It merely mentions that the compendium becomes enriched, literally ‘nourished’ (*puṣṭa*), if consulted in conjunction with the *Mukha*. Therefore, perhaps, we should understand that the *Mukha* is somehow related to all the *sūtras* while at the same time remaining an independent treatise.

Moreover, *Guhyasūtra* 18.15 tacitly suggests a separate identity for the *Niśvāsamukha*. It refers to the *Kārikā* (i.e. the *Niśvāsakārikā*) as the fifth *sūtra*, without, however, classifying the *Niśvāsamukha* as belonging to the same category:

*catvāro*<sup>59</sup> *kathitā sūtrā samukhādyā varānane* |  
*pañcamam tu param*<sup>60</sup> *sūtram kārikā nāma nāmataḥ* ||

The four *sūtras* have been taught, the *Mukha* being [their] beginning, o lovely-faced lady! The fifth is the highest *sūtra*, called *Kārikā* by name.

In addition, the post-colophon statement of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* supports our assumption of a separate identity of the *Niśvāsamukha*. The post-colophon counts only the number of verses of the four *sūtras* and explicitly refers to the collection as a group of four. It thereby excludes the *Niśvāsamukha*: *asmin sūtra-catustaṣṭaye sahasracatustaṣṭayaṃ ślokaṃ śatāni pañca ca iti* |, ‘in this fourfold collection *sūtras* there are four thousand and five hundred verses.’ The stated number roughly matches the total sum of verses of these four *sūtras*, thereby providing further textual evidence for an originally separate, though eventually associated identity of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Had the *Niśvāsamukha*’s verses been included in the verse-number counted by the scribe, the numbering would have easily exceeded five thousand.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>57</sup> GOODALL et al. (2015: 22) advance an altogether dependable theory concerning the relative chronology of the *Niśvāsa*-corpus in stating that

We are ... confident that the *Mūlasūtra* was followed by the *Uttarasūtra*, which was followed by the *Nayasūtra*, which was in turn followed by the *Guhyasūtra*, exactly the order in which those works are transmitted in the manuscript.

<sup>58</sup> It hence seems plausible to assume that the phrase *tatra sūtratrayaṃ proktaṃ boddhavyam anupūrvaśaḥ* indicates that one should understand the chronology of these three texts in due order: first, the *Mūlasūtra*, second the *Uttarasūtra*, and third the *Nayasūtra*. The fourth *sūtra*, the *Guhyasūtra*, in conjunction with the previous three texts comprise a compendium that is referred to as the *Niśvāsa*.

<sup>59</sup> *catvāro* ] NW; *catvāro(h)* K

<sup>60</sup> *pañcamam tu param* ] K; *pañcamaṃ tu para* NW

<sup>61</sup> Note that the *Niśvāsamukha* contains roughly 640 verses in total, extending over four chapters.

The theory attesting an originally separate identity to the *Niśvāsamukha* gains further momentum if we consider the textual evidence provided by the colophons and chapter-colophons of the relevant witnesses. There is a substantial difference between the chapter-colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha* and the colophons to the other books of the *Niśvāsa*-corpus, and we shall therefore present these separately. The first chapter's colophon contains the phrase *laukike dharme* 'worldly religion'; the second and third reduce this segment to the term *laukike* 'worldly'; the fourth chapter colophon contains neither of these two expressions, since it does not treat worldly religion. Each begins with the phrase *iti niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ*, providing clear evidence that all four chapters have been regarded as belonging to a work entitled ***Niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā***. Here are the chapter colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha* in full:

- *iti niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ laukike dharmme prathamah paṭalaḥ* | .
- *iti niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ laukike dvitīyah paṭalaḥ* | .
- *iti niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ laukike tṛtīyah paṭalaḥ* | .
- *iti niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ caturthah paṭalaḥ* | .

The colophons of the other four books of the *Niśvāsa*, however, differ both by way of formulation and classification of its referent text. In particular, these are the colophons of the first chapters of the *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra*, *Nayasūtra* and *Guhya-sūtra*. Note that these colophons categorize those works as separate *sūtras*, together comprising the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*:<sup>62</sup>

- *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ mūlasūtre prathamah paṭalaḥ* | .
- *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ uttarasūtre prathamah paṭalaḥ* | .
- *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ nayasūtre pāśaprakaraṇaṃ prathamah paṭalaḥ* | .
- *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ*<sup>63</sup> *guhya-sūtre prathamah paṭalaḥ* | .

As regards the most fundamental difference, the chapter-colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha* do not associate the *Niśvāsamukha* with the ***Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā***

<sup>62</sup> The complete colophon at the end of the first chapter of the *Mūlasūtra* in fact reads: *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ mūlasūtre prathamah paṭalaḥ ślo* [sic] *23* 'thus is the first chapter of the *Mūlasūtra* in the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*', followed by the number of verses. The second chapter colophon of the *Mūlasūtra*, however, runs: *iti mūlasūtre dvitīyah paṭalaḥ* 'thus is the second chapter of the *Mūlasūtra*.' This is also the way the colophons of the *Uttarasūtra*, *Nayasūtra*, and *Guhya-sūtra* appear in our manuscript. In other words, the first colophon of each of these books appears in its complete form, including the name of the compendium, the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, while in the succeeding colophons this name is not mentioned, the chapter names appearing directly in the locative: °*sūtre* ... *paṭalaḥ*.

<sup>63</sup> *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ* ] NW; *iti śrīniśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ* K

as closely as the colophons of the remaining four books associate their respective ‘parent’-work with the compendium. This is indicative of a basic discrepancy between the textual histories of the *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra*, *Nayasūtra*, and *Guhya-sūtra* on the one hand, and the *Niśvāsamukha* on the other—at least as regards their respective history *before* their conjunction as constitutive elements of the compendium.

Note that the chapter-colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha* state that the work professedly belongs to the ***Niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā*** whereas the remaining four books in their colophons attest to belong to the ***Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā***.

Secondly, the colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha* do not identify their referent text as an exponent of the *sūtra*-genre, whereas the colophons of the other four books do. Textual evidence shows that the term *sūtra* features in reference to titles of some of the works pertaining to the Mantramārga, such as the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* or the *Svāyaṃbhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha*. This, in turn, suggests that the term *sūtra*, as it features in the colophons of the four books of the *Niśvāsa*, might possibly serve to identify the latter as a tantric text. The chapter colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha*, by contrast, refer to the latter as the ***Niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā***.

In deliberately refraining from employing the term ‘*sūtra*’ in the titular compend, they fortify our conception regarding the identity of the *Niśvāsamukha* as distinct from the other books of the *Niśvāsa*. Whereas the latter is identified as tantric material, the *Niśvāsamukha* remains exoteric in nature.

The term *svargāpavarga* is a brahmanical term<sup>64</sup> particular to the mode of expression in the *Niśvāsamukha* (1.52, 4.1); this becomes especially clear when contrasted with the remaining works of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. The first three books, the *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra*, and *Nayasūtra* do not use this term. However, it appears once in conjunction with *niraya* (‘hell’) at *Guhyasūtra* 6.14 to describe the ‘sphere of actions’ (*karmabhūmi*). This may suggest that this term was not a distinctly Mantramārgic term. The unique term *svargāpavarga* appears to reflect and reinforce the distinct nature of the *Niśvāsamukha*, and emphasises its historical genesis as a work of probably separate origin.

## The *Niśvāsamukha*’s introduction of the Mantramārga through the ‘Five Streams’

As the ‘face’ of the compendium, the *Niśvāsamukha* heralds the Five Streams of (supra)mundane knowledge. In doing so, it recapitulates appropriated exoteric systems. At the same time, it announces the distinguishing features of the Mantramārga as supreme path of practice (to be expounded in the ensuing volumes of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*).

<sup>64</sup> The term is employed in these and other brahmanical textual sources: *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.6.10; *Brahmaṇḍapurāṇa* 1.16.15 and *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 4.24.37.



The concept of the Five Streams (*pañca srotāḥ*) is hence figuratively correlated both (1) to the five faces of Śiva as source and authority over the tenet-systems expounded, as well as (2) to the tenet-systems themselves. Therefore the *pañca srotāḥ* are instrumental in structuring the philosophical and religious systems presented in the *Niśvāsamukha* (1.26–27a) by means of the following five-fold taxonomy:

*nandikeśvara uvāca |*  
*śṛṇvantu ṛṣayas sarve pañcadhā yat prakīrtitam |*  
*laukikaṃ vaidikañ caiva tathādhyātmikam eva ca |*  
*a[[timārgaṃ ca mantrākhyam]] --- |*

Nandikeśvara said: all you sages, listen to that which is said to be five-fold: [1] worldly (*laukikaṃ*), [2] Vedic (*vaidikaṃ*), [3] relating to the soul (*ādhyātmikam*), [4] transcendent (*atimārgam*), and [5] Mantra (*mantrākhyam*) [...].

The Laukika stream, as depicted in later passages of the *Niśvāsamukha*, springs from the western face, Sadyojāta, (3.196cd); the Vaidika originates from the northern face, Vāmadeva, (4.41); the Ādhyātmika flows forth from the southern face, Aghora, (4.42); the Atimārga issues forth from the eastern face, Tatpuruṣa, (4.131cd); and finally the Mantramārga is emitted from the upper face, Īśāna (4.135).

The account of the *Niśvāsamukha* is special in that it is comparatively elaborate, as we shall find in the following in-depth presentation of the four exoteric, preliminary streams:<sup>65</sup>

1. **The Laukika dharma**, as taught in the *Niśvāsamukha*, is framed and presented as a system of practice befitting uninitiated householders devoted to Śiva. It teaches this path of practice as follows:

*kūpavāpīgrhodyāna --- |*  
*--- tha maṇḍapāḥ |*  
*dānatīrthopavāsāni vratāni niyamāni ca || 1.53*  
*bhakṣyābhakṣyaparihārañ japahoman tathārcaṇam |*  
*jalāgnibhṛgupāto hi tathānaśanam eva ca || 1.54*  
*vidyamānanivṛttiś ca guruvṛddhābhipūjanam |*  
*laukikaṃ kathitaṃ hy etad | 1.55c*

[Attending to] wells, ponds, houses, gardens [...] [and] pavilions (*maṇḍapāḥ*), [making] donations, [going on] pilgrimages (*tīrtha*), fasting, [adhering to] religious observances and restraints; [eating] what may be eaten and avoiding what may not (*bhakṣyābhakṣyaparihāram*); [engaging in] mantra recitations, sacrifices (*japahomam*)

<sup>65</sup> The fifth stream, the Mantramārga, is mentioned, yet merely briefly alluded to, as we shall see in the ensuing sections.

and worship; [committing suicide by] throwing oneself into water or fire or from a cliff; fasting, renouncing possessions (*vidyamāna-nivṛttiḥ*) and honouring teachers and aged people; this is what I have taught as *laukika*.

As the above extract itself professes in its last line, this is what the *Niśvāsa-mukha* presents as a brief summary of *Laukika* dharma, which is more extensively presented in the ensuing chapters (1–3).

The first chapter calls for the making of a water-fountain, lotus-pond, temple-garden, and the offering of a house; bathing a *liṅga* in milk, clarified butter, curds, and water; the offering of flowers, fragrant items, incense, clothing, ornaments, edibles, banners, mirrors, and awnings; the offering of lamps and umbrella(s), cows, goats, sheep, buffaloes, horses and elephants; the offering of servants and maids; the offering consisting in cleansing and besmearing a *liṅga*; the offering of singing, dancing, and playing a lute and other musical instruments in the vicinity of a *liṅga*; keeping vigil on the eighth and fourteenth days of the dark half of the month; fasting and taking refuge in Śiva. This chapter also records a tradition of offering a certain *muktimanḍapa* to Śiva (1.114c–115b). A *muktimanḍapa* as an object of offering is little known elsewhere.<sup>66</sup>

The second chapter calls for the making of a *liṅga* and installing it in a temple; constructing a temple and installing a figure of one of the following deities therein: Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Skanda, Rudrāṇī, Gaṇeśa, the mother goddesses, the Sun (conceived of as deity), Agni, Indra, Kubera, Vāyu, Dharma or Varuṇa; making a bridge; making a causeway on a muddy path; digging a water channel; making a hut, an abode or a pavilion; and giving different kinds of donations. A striking feature of this chapter is that its text provides us with material on traditions that are otherwise little known, or sometimes even not knowable through other sources at all. For instance, at 2.64, we come across a passage which records the practice of offering a woman. The text does not specify to whom the woman is to be offered, but the recipient is probably either a Brāhmin or Śiva, as the text constantly mentions these two recipients throughout.<sup>67</sup> If Śiva was the intended recipient here, then the text would allude to the practice of offering a Devadāsī, a [female] ‘servant of god’. If a Brāhmin was intended as recipient, this would be unusual practice. However, because the text proceeds (2.65) with the offering of lovemaking with beautiful women —presented as a physical and not a symbolic act —,<sup>68</sup> this also does not seem impossible. Whoever the intended recipient may have been,

<sup>66</sup> See 1.114c–115b and our annotation thereon (p. 252).

<sup>67</sup> On one occasion the text (2.117 ff.) mentions other recipients too, but it does so while presenting a stratified hierarchy of recipients.

<sup>68</sup> To wit: *ratisatran tu satataṃ varanāriṣu dāpayet*.

and whether or not the text is recording an actual practice, this custom is not known to us from other sources. The text teaches the worship of Kāmadeva (3.142c–146) on the thirteenth day of a fortnight. Although, the worship of Kāmadeva is not unknown,<sup>69</sup> the emphasis on his worship among other major gods, such as Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, considerably elevates the status of the deity Kāmadeva. This suggests that the place of Kāmadeva as a divinity to be worshipped was relatively lofty during this period, or at least in the specific milieu where the text originated.

The third chapter, for its part, calls for the following: bathing in prescribed rivers or lakes; committing suicide in a river or in a fire; going on pilgrimage to places sacred to Śiva; and to those sacred to Viṣṇu; upholding observances; following procedures<sup>70</sup> for fasting and performing worship of Śiva and other deities that are perceived through a lens of individually assigned, and differing, degrees of worthiness;<sup>71</sup> each of these has a particular day of the lunar fortnight

---

<sup>69</sup> See BENTON 2006.94.

<sup>70</sup> These procedures are observed during both halves of a month for the duration of one year.

<sup>71</sup> These deities (or deified beings) are Brahmā, Agni, Kubera, Gaṇeśa, the Nāgas, Skanda, the Sun, Śiva, Mahādevī, Yama, Dharma, Keśava, Kāmadeva, Śiva (a second time) and one's ancestors.

dedicated to their worship.<sup>72</sup> The text informs us about various appropriate offerings such as a golden carriage, a weapon, or an emblem of each deity with that deity's name engraved on it (see 3.160ff). It also records a custom of

<sup>72</sup> Twelve names are to be used for each of these deities during twelve months, starting from Mārgaśīrṣa to Kārttika for each fortnight on their respective *tithis*. In the case of some deities, the number of names does not match twelve (Agni, the Nāgas, Yama). We present here the names as attested in the text:

- Brahmā: [1] Brahmā, [2] Svayambhū, [3] Viriñci, [4] Padmayoni, [5] Prajāpati, [6] Caturmukha, [7] Padmahasta, [8] Oṃkāṛākṣara, [9] Caturvedadhara, [10] Sraṣṭṛ, [11] Gīrvāṇa, and [12] Parameṣṭhin.
- Agni: [1] Vaiśvānara, [2] Jātavedas, [3] Hutabhuk, [4] Havyavāhana, [5] Devavaktra, [6] Sarvabhakṣa, [7] Ghr̥ṇin, [8] Jagadāhaka, [9] Vibhāvasu and [10] Saptajihva. *Since Agni is to be worshipped throughout the year, one form per month, the listing lacks two names.*
- Kubera: [1] Dhanada, [2] Yakṣapati, [3] Vitteśa, [4] Nidhipālaka, [5] Rākṣasādhipati, [6] Piṅgalākṣa, [7] Vimānaga, [8] Rudrasakhā, [9] Kubera, [10] Paulastyakulanandana, [11] Lokapāleśvara, and [12] Yakṣendra.
- Gaṇeśa: [1] Vighneśvara, [2] Gaṇapati, [3] Ekadanta, [4] Gajānana, [5] Gajakarṇa, [6] Tryakṣa, [7] Nāgayajñopavitin, [8] Caturbhuja, [9] Dhūmrākṣa, [10] Vajratuṇḍa, [11] Vināyaka, and [12] Mahodara.
- The Nāgas: [1] Ananta, [2] Vāsuki, [3] Takṣaka, [4] Tīrekhin, [5] Padma, [6] Mahābja, [7] Śaṅkha, and [8] Kulika.
- Skanda: [1] Viśākha, [2] Trivara, [3] Umānanda, [4] Agnigarbhaja, [5] Gaṅgāgarbha, [6] Śaradgarbha, [7] Kṛttikāsuta, [8] Śaṇmukha, [9] Śaktihasta, [10] Mayūravāhana, [11] Pañcachaṭa, and [12] Kumāra.
- Sun: [1] Āditya, [2] Savitr, [3] Sūrya, [4] Khaga, [5] Pūṣan, [6] Gabhastimat, [7] Hiranya-garbha, [8] Trīśiras, [9] Tapanā, [10] Bhāskara, [11] Ravi, and [12] Jagannetra.
- Śiva: [1] Śaṅkara, [2] Devadeva, [3] Tryambaka, [4] Sthāṇu, [5] Hara, [6] Śiva, [7] Bhava, [8] Nīlakaṇṭha, [9] Piṅgala, [10] Rudra, [11] Īśāna, and [12] Ugra.
- Mahādevī: [1] Umā, [2] Kātyāyinī, [3] Durgā, [4] Rudrā, [5] Subhadrikā, [6] Kālarātrī, [7] Mahāgaurī, [8] Revatī, [9] Bhūtanāyikā, [10] Āryā, [11] Prakṛtirūpā, and [12] Gaṇanāyikā.
- Yama: [1] Yama, [2] Dharmaraja, [3] Mr̥tyu, [4] Antaka, [5] Vaivasvata, [6] Kāla, [7] Sarvalokakṣaya, [8] Ugradaṇḍadhṛt, [9] Mahiṣāsanayāyin, [10] Śāsitr, and [11] Narakādhipati. *Since Yama is to be worshipped throughout the year, one form per month, the listing lacks one name.*
- Dharma: [1] Dharma, [2] Satya, [3] Dayā, [4] Kṣānti, [5] Śauca, [6] Ācāra, [7] Ahimsā, [8] Adambha, [9] Rakṣā, [10] Lokasākṣin, [11] Vṛṣabha, and [12] Adṛṣṭa.
- Viṣṇu: [1] Keśava, [2] Nārāyaṇa, [3] Mādhava, [4] Govinda, [5] Viṣṇu, [6] Madhusūdana, [7] Trivikrama, [8] Vāmana, [9] Śṛidhara, [10] Hṛṣīkeśa, [11] Padmanābha, and [12] Dāmodara.
- Kāmādeva: [1] Anaṅga, [2] Manmatha, [3] Kāma, [4] Īśvara, [5] Mohana, [6] Pañcabāṇa, [7] Dhanurhasta, [8] Unmāda, [9] Vaśaṃkara, [10] Ratipriya, [11] Prītikara, and [12] Hṛdayāpahārin.
- Śiva: [1] Hara, [2] Śarva, [3] Bhava, [4] Tryakṣa, [5] Śambhu, [6] Vibhu, [7] Śiva, [8] Sthāṇu, [9] Paśupati, [10] Rudra, [11] Īśāna, and [12] Śaṅkara.

offering ‘a golden man’ (*puruṣa*) with the name of one’s ancestor(s) on it on the new-moon and full-moon days (3.193–196). This injunction is not known from other sources.

Day of fortnight	Deity worshipped	Gift to be offered
Pratipad	Brahmā	golden lotus
Dvitiyā	Agni	golden goat
Tṛtīyā	Yakṣa	golden mace
Caturthī	Gaṇeśa	golden elephant
Pañcamī	Nāgas	golden lotus
Ṣaṣṭhī	Skanda	golden peacock
Saptamī	Āditya	golden horse
Aṣṭamī	Śaṅkara	[golden] bull
Navamī	Mahādevī	[golden] lion
Daśamī	Yama	[golden] buffalo
Ekādaśī	Dharma	[golden] bull
Dvādaśī	Viṣṇu	[golden] Garuḍa
Trayodaśī	Kāmadeva	golden bow
Caturdaśī	Pārameśvara	[golden] bull
Amāvaśī and Pūrṇimā	Pitṛs	golden man

**Table 1:** Deities, their days, and appropriate offerings

The Kashmirian Saiddhāntika commentator Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha<sup>73</sup> — and also the South Indian author of the *Mṛgendrapaddhatitika*<sup>74</sup> — seem to share the same understanding of Laukika dharma as constituting socially meritorious deeds. For Kṣemarāja, however, author of a non-dualist commentary on the *Svacchandatantra*, it carries a diversity of connotations and encompasses the following topics: (admissible modes of) livelihood; law; the art of government; Āyurveda; Dhanurveda etc.<sup>75</sup> The *Niśvāsamukha*’s understanding of Laukika dharma is different: as is clear from the above discussion, it is not presented merely as primarily comprising of socially meritorious deeds, nor does it embrace Āyurveda, Dhanurveda, and law.

2. **Vaidika dharma** outranks Laukika in the five-fold hierarchy presented in the *Niśvāsamukha* and pertains to the four *āśramas*.<sup>76</sup> The *Niśvāsamukha* (4.1–41) teaches that observing the prescriptions pertaining to the four life-stages

<sup>73</sup> See the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha on *Mṛgendrakriyāpāda* 8.79: *tatra laukikāni tāvat karmāṇi vāpikūpaprapādīni pūrtākhyāni* |.

<sup>74</sup> T. 1021, pp. 217, line, 15: *kūpataṭākādikaraṇaṃ paraṃ pūrtam ucyate* |.

<sup>75</sup> Kṣemarāja’s commentary on *Svacchandatantra* 11.44: *laukikaṃ vārtādaṇḍanītyāyurveda-dhanurvedanāṭyavedādīpratipādīdyakṛṣṇinayānāyacikitsādivijñānam* |.

<sup>76</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* 1.55d: *vaidikaṃ cāturaśramam*.

results in a rebirth in the abode of Brahman.<sup>77</sup> Meanwhile, it should be noted that according to 4.24, a householder (*grhastha*) who merely performs rites, and does not cultivate *ātmadhyānam* (meditation on the Self) attains heaven only, which, technically speaking, counts as a ‘worldly abode’, since it belongs to the domain of *saṃsāra*—in that regard the fruits are identical to those of the practice of Laukika dharma.<sup>78</sup> SANDERSON (2006: 157) observes:

The distinction between this and the Vaidika religion (*vaidiko dharmaḥ*) is that the latter is the practice of the celibate life-stages. It comes above the Mundane in the hierarchy of paths because we are told that while the Mundane leads only to heaven (*svargaḥ*), this may go beyond that transient reward to bestow [...] liberation.

Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha,<sup>79</sup> and the author of the *Mṛgendrapaddhatīkā*<sup>80</sup> see the Vaidika stream as being concerned primarily with *soma* sacrifices ‘and the like’ (*somasamsthādirūpāṇi*). This understanding—as noted above—differs considerably from that of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Kṣemarāja, again, reiterates the categories of *yajña* taught in (some of) the *Kalpasūtras*,<sup>81</sup> focussing on *nitya*, *naimittika* and *kāmya* sacrifices.<sup>82</sup>

### 3. *Ādhyātmika dharma* is understood as the teaching of Sāṅkhya and Yoga:

*ādhyātmikam pravakṣyāmi dakṣiṇāsyena kīrttitam |*  
*sāṃkhyāṃ caiva mahājñānam yogaṃ cāpi mahāvrate || 4.42 ||*

[Now] I will teach the [*dharma*] called *ādhyātmika* with [my] southern face: [namely] the great knowledge of Sāṅkhya and Yoga, o you who observe the *mahāvrate*.

Let us consider a noteworthy taxonomical irregularity: the classification of the teachings of the Sāṅkhya and Yoga as forming part of the *Ādhyātmika* system is unusual — all the more so since the Upaniṣads, conventionally hailed as pivotal exponents of the *Ādhyātmika* religion, curiously are not listed in the *Niśvāsamukha* as such. We do not, at present, have a ready explanation

<sup>77</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* 4.39: *evam yo varttate nityam sa yāti brahmalaukikam | brahmaṇā saha modeta brahmaṇi sa tu līyate ||*.

<sup>78</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* 1.52cd: *laukikam sampravakṣyāmi yena svargam vrajanti te |*.

<sup>79</sup> In his commentary on *Mṛgendrakriyāpāda*, Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha writes (8.79): *āmnāyo vedah | taduktāni tu karmāṇy api karmakṛcchrajananyāni somasamsthādirūpāṇi iṣṭaśabdena prasiddhāni |*.

<sup>80</sup> *Mṛgendrapaddhatīkā* T. 1021, p. 217: *tat kṛcchraśabdena somasamsthādyātmakam iṣṭam ucyate |*.

<sup>81</sup> This presentation is generally in line with the threefold classification found in Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha’s *Mṛgendratāntra*, and the *Mṛgendrapaddhatīkā*.

<sup>82</sup> The commentary on *Svacchandatantra* 11.44: *vaidikam nityanaimittikakāmyayajñādisvarūpam |*.

for this state of affairs. Medhātithi<sup>83</sup> and Kullūka,<sup>84</sup> commenting on a verse of the *Manusmṛti* (2.117) — which, as we shall see, is probably the original impetus for the development of the fivefold scheme of the *Niśvāsamukha* — understand Ādhyātmika in the conventional sense: for Medhātithi, it is the knowledge of *brahman*,<sup>85</sup> and for Kullūka, it is something related to the Upaniṣadic knowledge of the Self.<sup>86</sup> Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha<sup>87</sup> follows the orthodox interpretation in stating *abhisandhirūpāṇi vairāgyātmakāni* |. The interpretation of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha is moreover echoed by the author of the *Mṛgendrapaddhatīkā*,<sup>88</sup> and Kṣemarāja,<sup>89</sup> both of whom treat the term as referring to the teachings of Yoga and Sāṅkhya.

4. **Atimārga** refers to the Pāśupata system, which, in this text, is said to be twofold.<sup>90</sup> That is to say, it refers to Atyāśramins and Lokātītas.<sup>91</sup> The first section paraphrases the *Pāśupatasūtras* in a fully versified form. The second section teaches the observances of the Kapālavratins and provides a systematic account of Kāpālika cosmology.<sup>92</sup> SANDERSON (2006: 158) writes:

... the *Niśvāsamukha* holds it ([i.e. Atimārga]) to be of two kinds (*dviṣṭakārakaḥ*). It outlines the first, which it calls ‘the Observance of those beyond the Estates’ (*Atyāśramavrata*) in a rendering of the enigmatic prose *Pāśupatasūtra* into verses that are clear (where they are not lacunose by dint of physical damage) and adds a small amount of information found neither in the *Sūtras* nor in Kaunḍinya’s commentary. The first level of the Atimārga, then, is that of the Pāñcārthikas. The remainder of the section on the Atimārga introduces us to a new form of devotion to Rudra, which it calls Kapālavrata (‘the observance of the skull’), the Lokātītavrata (‘the observance of those beyond the world’) and the Mahāpāśupata-vrata (‘the observance of the Greater Pāśupatas’). It also refers to those who adopt this observance as the Mahāvratas.

<sup>83</sup> See JHĀ (1932: 136).

<sup>84</sup> See N. R. ACHARYA (1946: 58).

<sup>85</sup> *ādhyātmikaṃ brahmaññānam* |.

<sup>86</sup> *ādhyātmikavidyā ātmopaniṣadvidyā* |.

<sup>87</sup> Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, commenting on *Mṛgendrakriyāpāda* 8.79.

<sup>88</sup> T. 1021.217: *vairāgyaśabdenādhyātmikāny abhisandhirūpāṇi pātañjalasāṃkhyāni* (conj.; *pātañjalasāṃkhyāni* MS) *karmāṇy ucyante* |.

<sup>89</sup> The commentary on *Svacchandatantra* 11.44: *ādhyātmikaṃ sāṃkhyayogādipratipāditaprakṛti-puruṣavivekajñānasarvavṛttinirodhajñānādīkam* |.

<sup>90</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* 4.131: *atimārggaṃ samākhyātaṃ dviṣṭa*[[*kāraṃ va(rā)*]] *nane* || 4.131.

<sup>91</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* (4.88).

<sup>92</sup> As we have noted on p. 54, the account given in the *Niśvāsamukha* may indeed be systematically rendered, but the truthfulness of its content can as of yet not be fully ascertained, since there is no further extant source material to compare and contrast it against.

The *Svacchandatantra* too (11.45–45) takes the Atimārga as inextricably linked to the Pāśupata system, and this is further spelled out in *Svacchandatantra* 11.179–184.<sup>93</sup> The *Siddhāntasamuccaya*<sup>94</sup> of Trilocana also makes this identification: *atimārgaṃ punaḥ pāśupatādiḥ*|. But SANDERSON (2006: 158) points out that when Kṣemarāja comments on *Svacchandatantra* 11.43–45 and 11.179–184, he does not distinguish the Atimārga and the Mantramārga in terms of non-Āgamic Śaivism and Āgamic Śaivism:<sup>95</sup>

Thus when Kṣemarāja comments on the same list of five when it occurs at *Svacchanda* 11.43c–45b he does not see its distinction between the ‘Atimārga’ and the fifth as a distinction between non-Āgamic and Āgamic Śaivism. According to him – and he is, after all, one of the most influential of Āgamic authorities – the knowledge of the ‘Atimārga’ mentioned in the text is knowledge of the externals of Āgamic Śaivism itself, while the fifth level is knowledge of the core of the same system.

SANDERSON proceeds by cogently inferring (2006: 162–163) why the redactor(s) of the *Mṛgendratāntra* and the commentator Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha failed to associate the Atimārga with non-Āgamic Śaivism.<sup>96</sup> We observe a complete misunderstanding of the sense of Atimārga in the *Tantrāloka* of Jayaratha, who, commenting on the tantra at 13.346, asserts that the Atimārga refers to such systems as Sāṅkhya and Yoga, which, in his work, are elevated above the Laukika religion: *atimārgo laukikamārgātītaṃ sāmṛkhyapātāñjalādi*|. It is not clear what Abhinavagupta, for his part, may have thought about the matter. SANDERSON (2006: 163) concludes:

The term Atimārga, which I suggest we use for the non-Āgamic Śaivism of the Pāśupatas and related systems, is extracted, then, from a stage of the tradition which predates our famous commentators and perhaps even some of the Āgamas themselves. But I make no apology for putting it back to use: the dominion of these commentaries over later tradition need not extend to us.

As we have seen above, the Atimārga is elevated above the Ādhyātmika in the *Niśvāsamukha*, the *Svacchandatantra* and the *Pūrvakāmika*; yet in the *Mṛgendratāntra*, their positions are reversed. Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha (ad

<sup>93</sup> See SANDERSON (2006: 158–160).

<sup>94</sup> T. 284, pp. 153, lines 1–2.

<sup>95</sup> Note that ‘non-Āgamic Śaivism’ and ‘Āgamic Śaivism’ are SANDERSON’s translations for the terms ‘Atimārga’ and ‘Mantramārga’ respectively.

<sup>96</sup> Note that for the author of the *Mṛgendrapaddhatīkā* (T. 1021, p. 217), too, followers of the Atimārga are identified as Pāśupatas.



loc.), however, notes that the Atimārga should technically eclipse the Ādhyātmika, advancing the contention that a sequencing according to the loftiness of the *purpose* (*arthakrama*) surpasses an order mirroring simply the chronological progression in which individual sections are to be read (*pāthakrama*).<sup>97</sup> It is worth noting that the *Mṛgendrapaddhatīkā*<sup>98</sup> quotes verses 8.78–79 from the *Mṛgendratāntṛa*, but, in commenting on them, alters the constellation of the hierarchy found therein.<sup>99</sup>

5. The **Mantramārga** is identified as coterminous with Āgamic Śaivism. The *Niśvāsamukha* (1.56c) plainly enunciates: *mantrākhyāś ca tathā śaivāḥ* ‘and the followers of the *mantra*[-path] are Śaivas.’ For the author of the *Mṛgendratāntṛa*<sup>100</sup> and *Kāmika*,<sup>101</sup> the term conveys the same meaning. It is not clear, however, whether it is understood in the same way by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, when he comments on *Mṛgendrakriyāpāda* 8.79, or whether Kṣemarāja<sup>102</sup> understands it thus, or whether the author of the *Mṛgendrapaddhatīkā* does.<sup>103</sup>

The above account sketches how the five major traditions discussed in the *Niśvāsamukha* are presented through an equation with the ‘Five Streams’. These, in turn, are structurally embedded in the notion of five faces of Sadāśiva being their source. Can it be ascertained, however, whether the concept of the *Niśvāsamukha*’s five streams is an innovation of the *Niśvāsamukha* or not? There is a distinct possibility that it was influenced by a passage in the *Manusmṛti*, for we encounter a related concept already attested in the *Manusmṛti* (2.117), which has been adopted later by the *Viṣṇusmṛti* (30.43):<sup>104</sup>

*laukikaṃ vaidikaṃ vāpi tathādhyātmikaṃ eva ca |*  
*ādadīta yato jñānaṃ taṃ pūrvam abhivādayet ||*

He should greet first the person from whom he received knowledge—whether it is the knowledge of worldly matters, of the Veda, or of the inner self. (OLIVELLE 2005: 101)

We have grounds to assume that *Niśvāsamukha* 1.26cd (*laukikaṃ vaidikaṃ caiva tathādhyātmikaṃ eva ca*) is formulated on the basis of the *Manusmṛti* (2.117ab), because the formulation in the *Niśvāsamukha*—in its complete form—is very similar to its counterpart in the *Manusmṛti*: the only difference is the *Niśvāsamukha*’s *caiva* in place of *vāpi* in the *Manusmṛti*—the meaning of these two expressions, however,

<sup>97</sup> See SANDERSON 2006: 162.

<sup>98</sup> *Mṛgendrapaddhatīkā* (T. 1021, pp. 217–218).

<sup>99</sup> The *Mṛgendrapaddhatīkā* describes the Atimārga as excelling the Ādhyātmika.

<sup>100</sup> See *Mṛgendrakriyāpāda* 8.78.

<sup>101</sup> See *Pūrvakāmika* 3.20 ff.

<sup>102</sup> Kṣemarāja’s gloss on *Svacchandatanrodhyota* 22.44.

<sup>103</sup> T. 1021.218.

<sup>104</sup> Peter BISSCHOP is to be credited with the reference to this item of evidence.

remains the same. Thus, we think, it is likely that the conceptual framework of the five streams of the *Niśvāsamukha* is based on the model of the three categories of knowledge as expounded in the *Manusmṛti*, with an addition of two more elements: the Atimārga and the Mantramārga. It is therefore quite possible that the *Niśvāsamukha* first developed the notion of Five Streams in expansion of the basic notions of the *Manusmṛti*.

Furthermore, a scheme of Five Streams features in the *Guhyasūtra* (12.17–18), although with significant discrepancies vis-à-vis the *Niśvāsamukha*. On one hand, the fact that Śaiva Siddhānta is revealed by Īśāna presents a point of congruence between the two expositions. On the other, the remaining four streams differ from those presented in the *Niśvāsamukha*. In the account of the *Guhyasūtra*, the remaining four streams exclusively refer to Pāśupata schools and are associated with the four faces of Śiva as follows: Vaimala is revealed by Tatpuruṣa; Pramāṇa by Aghora; Kārūka by Vāmadeva; and the doctrine of Lakulīśa by Sadyojāta.<sup>105</sup>

*pañcabhis tu tataḥ sarvaṃ yad bhūtaṃ yac ca bhāvyati |*  
*īśāne*<sup>106</sup> *śaivam utpannaṃ vaimalaṃ puruṣāt*<sup>107</sup> *smṛtam ||*  
*pramāṇaṃ hṛdayāj jātaṃ vāmadevāt tu kārūkam |*<sup>108</sup>  
*sadyāc ca lakulīśāntaḥ*<sup>109</sup> *pañcabhedāḥ prakīrtitāḥ ||*

Thus all creation, as well as what is in the future to be created, [is effected] by the[se] five [**Brahmamantras/faces**]. It is on [the basis of] Īśāna, [that] Śiva came into being; the Vimala [school] is understood to be [emanated] from the Puruṣa; the Pramāṇa [school] springs from the Hṛdaya; from Vāmadeva, however, the Kārūka [came to be]; from the Sadyojāta, the doctrine of Lakulīśa [is proclaimed]—these five divisions have been taught.

Given the congruities between the system of revelation of Śaiva clusters of knowledge as extrapolated both in the *Guhyasūtra* and in the *Niśvāsamukha*, it appears possible that a common source, drawn from earlier Śaiva works, informed the conception of five streams of knowledge as they (re)appear in the *Guhyasūtra* and the *Niśvāsamukha*. It cannot, as of yet, be established with a reasonable degree of certainty, whether earlier sources already depicted Īśāna as the supreme herald of the Mantramārga, which is the account given in the *Niśvāsamukha*.<sup>110</sup>

<sup>105</sup> For discussion of these four divisions of Pāśupata sects, see SANDERSON (1988: 664–667).

<sup>106</sup> *īśāne* ] N; *īśānaṃ* K; *īśāne* W

<sup>107</sup> *puruṣāt* ] *conj.*; *puruṣā* NW; *puruṣam* K

<sup>108</sup> *hṛdayāj jātaṃ vāmadevāt tu kārūkam* ] *conj.*; *hṛdayāj jātaṃ vāmade* --- n tu kārakam N; *hṛdayā* 𑀭n tu kārakam K; *hṛdayā jātaṃ vāmade* 𑀭n tu kārakam W

<sup>109</sup> *sadyāc ca lakulīśāntaḥ* ] *conj.* Sanderson; *sadyāc ca lakulīśāntaḥ* NK<sup>pc</sup>; *sadyoc ca lakulīśāntaḥ* K<sup>ac</sup>; *sadyāmba lakulīśāntaḥ* W

<sup>110</sup> The model of revelation presented in the figurative garb of the Five Streams of tantric Śaiva knowledge is found in a broad range of later scriptures. According to this model, the *Siddhānta*-

What is striking about the way this taxonomy is relayed is that the *Niśvāsamukha* is amongst the earliest extant textual sources presenting Śiva as a five-headed divinity. Hans BAKKER (2002), for example, has already noted that Śiva is not presented as a five-headed deity in the *Mahābhārata*. In the same vein, TÖRZSÖK (2013) mentions that a five-headed form of Śiva is absent in the early layer of the *Niśvāsa*-corpus and other relatively early Śaiva sources. Instead, TÖRZSÖK posits (2013: 152–153) that a four-faced depiction is attested to in source material associated with the Atimārga; mention of a fifth face emerges in the context of the revelation of tantric Śaivism through the Śaiva Siddhānta. This has subsequently been adopted also by the non-Saiddhāntika traditions. As BAKKER shows, it is conceivable that the idea of Śiva's having five faces may have developed under the influence of the concept of the five Brahmamantras,<sup>111</sup> which are attested to in the *Taittirīyāranyaka* (10.43–46) and the *Pāśupatasūtra*, works which predate the *Niśvāsamukha*. The five mantras are known as 'Sadyojāta', 'Vāmadeva', 'Tatpuruṣa', 'Aghora', and 'Īśāna'—effectuating an exact correspondence between the names of the five faces of Śiva and the five Brahmamantras as presented in the *Niśvāsamukha*. We can therefore regard the notion that the five faces of Śiva were based on the literature and traditions centred around the five Brahmamantras as both credible and established, for the identification of the five faces with the five Brahmamantras appears to be a relatively late development in Śaivism.<sup>112</sup>

The textual evidence for the emergence of the fifth face as supreme enunciator of the Mantramārga is somewhat complex. In the account of the *Niśvāsamukha*, the fifth, Īśāna-face is associated with the Śaiva Siddhānta.<sup>113</sup> That section, however, does not specify whether the five Brahmamantras are identified with the Five Faces of Śiva—or rather of 'Sadāśiva', as he is known in his five-headed form. The *Guhya-sūtra* (12.17–18), on the other hand, introduces the idea that five forms of knowledge

---

*tantra* are proclaimed by the Īśāna face; the Bhairavatantras from Aghora; the Vāmatantras from Vāmadeva; the Bhūtatantra from Sadyojāta; and the Gāruḍatantra from Tatpuruṣa (see HATLEY 2010: 3). Since we are, at this point, primarily concerned with sources antecedent to the *Niśvāsa*, we do not actively pursue anything other than a tangential mention of the model as it features in later sources.

<sup>111</sup> See BAKKER (2002: 400).

<sup>112</sup> Consult BAKKER (2002: 400). As regards the textual evidence within the *Niśvāsamukha*, it merely mentions that Śiva has Five Faces, without further questioning or explaining that state of affairs: *Niśvāsamukha* 3.196cd: **paścīmenaiva vaktreṇa** laukikaṃ gaditaṃ sadā; *Niśvāsamukha* 4.41: vedadharmmo mayā proktaḥ svarganaśreyasaḥ paraḥ | **uttareṇaiva vaktreṇa** vyākhyātaḥ ca samāsataḥ; *Niśvāsamukha* 4.42: ādhyātmikaṃ pravakṣyāmi **dakṣiṇāsyena** kīrtitaṃ | sāṃkhyāṇ caiva mahājñānaṃ yogaṇ cāpi mahāvrate; *Niśvāsamukha* 4.131: atimārggaṃ samākhyātaṃ divhprākāraṃ varānane | **pūrveṇaiva tu vaktreṇa** sarahasyaṃ prakīrtitaṃ |; *Niśvāsamukha* 4.135: **pañcamenaiva vaktreṇa** īśānena divjottamāḥ | mantrākhyāṃ kathayīṣyāmi devyāyā gaditaṃ purā ||.

<sup>113</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* (4.135).

are derived from the five Brahmamantras; it is not clear, however, from that account, to what degree they are to be associated with the five faces of Sadāśiva.<sup>114</sup>

GOODALL et al. (2015: 38), after extensive scrutiny of the textual evidence regarding a connection of the five Brahmamantras with Sadāśiva in the *Niśvāsa*-corpus, conclude:

... it appears that the notion of a five-headed figure known as Sadāśiva ... whose five heads are the *brahmamantras*, is absent from the earliest *sūtras* of the *Niśvāsa* but is beginning to take shape in the latest layer of the text, namely that constituted by the *Niśvāsamukha* and *Guhyasūtra*.

Later works which feature the concept of ‘Five Streams of knowledge’<sup>115</sup> include the *Svacchandatantra*,<sup>116</sup> the *Pūrvakāmika*,<sup>117</sup> and the *Jayadrathayāmala*.<sup>118</sup> In contrast with these three texts, the five domains of religious activity listed in the *Mṛgendrakriyāpāda*<sup>119</sup> and *Mṛgendrapaddhatīkā* have undergone a significant process of transmogrification—both in wording and with regards to sentence-structure. The stratification in the *Mṛgendratāntra* (8.79) is as follows: [1] the mundane (*loka*); [2] the Vedic (*āmnāya*); [3] the transcendent (*Atimārga*); [4] the internal (*abhisamdhī*); and [5] the Śaiva.

### The *Niśvāsamukha* as a preface to the Mantramārga

In order to assess the type and scope of the *Niśvāsamukha*’s contribution to the Mantramārga at large, we will more closely investigate the narrative framework of the *Niśvāsamukha*.<sup>120</sup> Unfortunately, the text is lacunose, for which reason we are not able to represent every structural aspect with a fully satisfactory degree of precision. Although, as we shall see in a separate section, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* provides an abundance of textual parallels for the greater part of the *Niśvāsamukha*, there is an acute lack of textual parallels in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* from which to

<sup>114</sup> GOODALL et al. (2015: 36) likewise did not locate the five-faced form of the deity Sadāśiva in the *sūtras* of the *Niśvāsa*.

<sup>115</sup> Although all the ensuing sources refer to the same five streams—with the exception of the *Svacchandatantra*—they do not feature an association of the five faces of Śiva with the Five Streams.

<sup>116</sup> *Svacchandatantra* 11.43c–45b: *laukikaṃ devi vijñānaṃ sadyojātād vinirgatam | vaidikaṃ vāmadevāt tu ādhyātmikaṃ aghorataḥ || puruṣāc cātimārgākhyam nirgataṃ tu varānane | mantrākhyam tu mahājñānam īśānāt tu vinirgatam ||*.

<sup>117</sup> *Pūrvakāmika* 3.17c–18b: *laukikaṃ vaidikaṃ caiva tathādhhyātmikaṃ eva ca || atimārgaṃ ca mantrākhyam tantram etad anekadhā |*.

<sup>118</sup> SANDERSON (2006: 157, fn. 7).

<sup>119</sup> *Mṛgendrakriyāpāda* 8.78–79: *lokāmnāyātimārgābhisandhiśaivātmakāṇyaṇoḥ | karmāṇi kṣetrikādīśagaṇakāṅgāntakāni tu || karmatatkr̥cchraivairāgyajanyāni triṣu dhāmasu | yoga-vijñānanyāni parataḥ parato mune ||*.

<sup>120</sup> It is worth noting that the great majority of references to the Mantramārga occur in the frame-story of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

draw in substitution for deprecated sections of the frame-story.<sup>121</sup> That being said, we can nevertheless make a number of relevant observations regarding the narrative framework on the basis of the surviving textual evidence.

First of all, the overarching structure of the *Niśvāsamukha* is cast in the form of a narrative that presents the different tenet-systems by way of divine dialogue between Īśvara and Devī. This setting unmistakably insinuates that whatever is being announced is sanctioned by divine authority and judgment. Since the Mantramārga is presented as the ‘highest form of religion’ in this particular context, the narrative framework of the *Niśvāsamukha* directly conveys the idea of the supremacy of the Mantramārga.

Secondly, in elevating the Mantramārga above the other tenet-systems, the text makes skilful use of insinuating symbolism, both allegorical and topographical in nature.<sup>122</sup> For example, the Vedic and pro-Vedic sacred topography is directly and emphatically juxtaposed with that of the ascendant Śaiva school. The underlying ‘power-struggle’ is resolved by an astonished Ricika witnessing a score of sages, originally residents of the indisputably brahmanical Naimiṣāraṇya (Naimiṣa forest),<sup>123</sup> relocating to the Devadāruvana (Pine Forest), a holy Śaiva site.<sup>124</sup> Upon consulting Mataṅga, Ricika learns that the sages were inspired to do so upon having learnt that Brahmā and Viṣṇu themselves were initiated in the Pine Forest (1.16–18).

Religious activities associated with the Naimiṣa forest have been described in passages contained in the *Mahābhārata*<sup>125</sup> and in some of the *Purāṇas*.<sup>126</sup> The sages of the Naimiṣa forest are also presented as being engaged in performing extensive sacrifices, which evokes an unmistakably Vedic atmosphere in the context of the *Niśvāsamukha*; all the more so since it is precisely the Vedic sages of the Naimiṣa forest being engaged in elaborate rituals which we most easily associate with this holy site. In fact, the *Mahābhārata* itself, as well as many a *Purāṇa*, is traditionally presented as having been recited here for the first time—in brief, this place is imbued with special significance in brahmanical traditions.

The Devadāruvana, by contrast, is imbued with deep-rooted cultural associations

<sup>121</sup> For a comparative list of the parallels between the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* and the *Niśvāsamukha*, see page 92 ff.

<sup>122</sup> For example, the way the system of initiation in the Śaiva religion (1.18) differs from the Vedic initiatory system (1.8) is emphasized in a context that gives clear preference to the former.

<sup>123</sup> The Naimiṣa forest is known to us from the contexts of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Purāṇas* as one of the places of origin for the brahmanical tradition. Indeed, the very narrative of the *Mahābhārata* itself begins “with the arrival of the *sūta* in the Naimiṣa forest” (ROCHER 1986: 81). More extensive information of descriptions of the Naimiṣa forest as they feature in the *Mahābhārata* can be gleaned from ROCHER (1986: 70, 71, 81, 141, 161, 164, 168, 185, 226 and 232) and HILTEBEITEL (2001), in particular the third chapter (pp. 92 ff.).

<sup>124</sup> For a rendition of the myth related to the Devadāruvana, see JAHN (1915, 1916), DEUSSEN (1917: 119–120), and GONDA (1963: 211–212).

<sup>125</sup> See HILTEBEITEL (2001: 131).

<sup>126</sup> Consult, for example, *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* 1.1:165 and *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 1.1:4. See also BISSCHOP (2006: 217).

that, to the common mind, are inextricably linked to the Śaiva traditions. After all, it is the place where, according to Śaiva lore, *liṅga*-worship originated. We encounter the myth of the Devadāruvana for the first time in the *Skandapurāṇa*.<sup>127</sup> BISSCHOP (2006: 80) summarises the myth as follows:

... as they[, the sages,] were practising *tapas* in Devadāruvana, some person appeared, engulfed in *tejas*, in the form of a twice-born, a naked man, with a skull in his hand, his body covered with ashes and with an erect penis. At this sight they got angry and went after him, impelled by jealousy. The man, frightened and beaten by them, did not really get angry, but the blows and sticks that they raised were repelled and fell on their sons, wives and themselves in particular. The *liṅga* of that Lokapa fell down, after which he disappeared. With the falling of that *liṅga* in the middle of their hermitage, the virility of the four classes of beings was damaged. They have come to Deva for protection, that he may make them successful again.

To our knowledge the *Niśvāsamukha* is the first text to render Śaiva teachings against the backdrop of the Devadāruvana, thereby contextualising it as counter-model to the traditional setting in the Naimiṣa forest. We assume that in rendering the exodus of the sages to the Devadāruvana, thus favouring it over the Naimiṣa, the *Niśvāsamukha* may be fielding an allegorical ploy to illustrate the emergence of a new, professedly superior, religion with an identity that is to be perceived as distinct from the mainstream traditions.

What is striking in this rendition is that parts of the *Niśvāsamukha* make claims about Vedic deities and associated protagonists that would not only appear uncharacteristic in their original Vedic setting, but outright heterodox, such as the idea that Brahmā, Viṣṇu and all the sages (1.19, 1.27–28) were initiated in the Śaiva system of initiation (1.18), especially in the alien setting of the Devadāruvana.

## The *Niśvāsamukha*: A Mirror to Early Śaivism

When discussing textual parallels in the source material to the *Niśvāsamukha*,<sup>128</sup> we have noted that the text draws upon a substantial number of earlier works. Let us now dissect the particular *modus operandi* by which the *Niśvāsamukha* appropriates previous systems of thought. It does so chiefly by granting limited authority to the latters' textual exponents by way of subsumption into the lower four echelons of the five-fold taxonomy of tantric Śaivism. As we shall see, this stratagem becomes

<sup>127</sup> Note that the account of the Devadāruvana in the *Śivapurāṇa* postdates the rendition in the *Niśvāsamukha*.

<sup>128</sup> Refer to p. 18 above.

apparent upon scrutiny of recontextualized and reframed passages borrowed from the *Manusmṛti*, as well as the ‘profile of ideas’<sup>129</sup> expressed therein.

First of all, besides a long passage on the procedures of *liṅga*-worship and other Śaiva teachings, there is a host of standard practices readily traceable to established brahmanical traditions: pilgrimage (3.1 ff.); offering water and sesame seeds to ancestors (2.39); offering a two-faced cow (2.49); offering land (2.56); constructing gardens (1.61); planting trees (2.25); making food offerings (2.37) etc. The fact that the *Niśvāsamukha* is directly borrowing from the *Manusmṛti*, without any change in content, further demonstrates a close affiliation with the brahmanical traditions. For instance, the *Niśvāsamukha* (3.155) gives a list of the ancestors of the four castes (*varṇa*) as follows:

*pitaraś somapā vipre kṣatriye tu havirbhujāḥ |*  
*ājyapā vaiśyayonau tu śūdrāṇān tu sukālinaḥ ||*

In the case of a Brāhmin, the ancestors are [called] Somapās; in the case of a Kṣatriya, Havirbhujas; in the case of a Vaiśya, Ājyapas; and for Śūdras, [they are called] Sukālins.

A close juxtaposition of the *Manusmṛti* (3.197) testifies to an act of borrowing on the part of the *Niśvāsamukha*:

*somapā nāma viprāṇām kṣatriyāṇām havirbhujāḥ |*  
*vaiśyāṇām ājyapā nāma śūdrāṇām tu sukālinaḥ ||*

The ancestors of Brāhmins are called Somapas; of Kṣatriyas, Havirbhujas; of Vaiśyas, Ājyapas; and of Śūdras, Sukālins.<sup>130</sup> (OLIVELLE 2005: 118)

In choosing to appropriate<sup>131</sup> textual source material from the *Manusmṛti*, the *Niśvāsamukha* is implicitly accepting the former as an authoritative source. Thereby, we should be inclined to argue, the *Niśvāsamukha* tacitly assents to the social system that was conceived by the brahmanical tradition, and formulated in the *Manusmṛti*.

This above constellation results in what one might call the brahmanical-śaiva hybrid-nature of the tenet system presented in the *Niśvāsamukha*. This can be well-illustrated by the many passages which relate donative practices, for example. First of all, in all instances the recipient is either a Brāhmin or the deity Śiva (*e.g.* at 2.54 and 2.98) himself, albeit in his symbolical representation as a *liṅga*. The way Brahmanism is presented as subordinate and adjuvant to Śaivism, moreover, is well

<sup>129</sup> The term ‘profile of ideas’ (*Ideenprofil*) has been adapted from GRÜNENDAHL in SCHREINER, ed. (1997: 234), and is here employed with comparable connotations.

<sup>130</sup> In the same way, *Manusmṛti* 11.214 defines the *atikṛcchra* observance as *ekaikaṃ grāsam aśnīyāt tryahāṇi trīṇi pūrvavat | tryahaṃ copavased antyam atikṛcchraṃ caran dvijaḥ ||*, which is echoed in *Niśvāsamukha* 3.40 as follows: *ekaikaṃ bhakṣayed grāsaṃ trīṇy ahāni jitendriyaḥ | trirātropavasec caiva atikṛcchraṃ viśodhane ||*.

<sup>131</sup> For a detailed list of parallels in the *Niśvāsamukha* that have been traced to the *Manusmṛti*, see p.74 ff.

illustrated by a passage of the *Niśvāsamukha* (2.115–121) which presents a stratified hierarchy of worthiness of recipients of gifts—as we shall see, this schema clearly favours the Śaiva perspective. The prelude to this teaching is wrapped in divine dialogue, with Devī inquisitive about the most deserving recipient of munificent acts, a question that is directly addressed by Śiva (2.115) himself. Śiva, having given a general statement about the act of giving—the merit of which endures for eternity (2.116)—lists the degree of worthiness of the respective recipients (2.117–121) in hierarchical sequence.<sup>132</sup>

This passage attests to the fact that individuals granted high social standing in the brahmanical traditions feature as worthy recipients of donative practices, yet the most worthy recipient remains the knower of Śiva (*śivajñānī*). This is an indicator that Śaivism builds its theoretical framework on the legacy of its brahmanical predecessors, a view that has first been voiced in SANDERSON’s influential and extensive contribution ‘*The Śaiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period*’ (2009).<sup>133</sup> In that chapter, SANDERSON developed the theory that Śaivism appropriated major aspects of brahmanical culture. He convincingly argues (2009: 302) that the model of Śaivism is a combination of Śaivism and Brahmanism:

The religion of the Śaivas, then, was not Śaivism alone but an expression of religious syncretism propelled by Śaivism and Brahmanism. This fact is born[e] out not only by Śaiva literature but also by the biographical data and the epigraphic records of the activities of Śaiva kings.<sup>134</sup>

In order to establish the Mantramārga as the supreme avenue of religious practice, the *Niśvāsamukha* renders the religious framework by way of Five Streams, therein making skilfull use of potent allegorical symbolism. The depiction of Śaiva religion as embodied by Śiva displaying ‘five faces’ presents each of the faces as source and legitimizing authority of an equally valid ‘stream of teaching’. At the same time, the faces (together with the respectively associated ‘streams of teaching’) nevertheless differ as to their respective rank and soteriological fruit. This mirrors well our assessment that the *Niśvāsamukha* grants scriptural and traditional authority to all systems presented whilst reserving supremacy for the Mantramārga, extolled as being the highest path of practice. As we learn in the text, this ‘highest stream’ of the Mantramārga issues forth from the fifth, uppermost face (Īśāna):

*adhunā tad ato viprās saṃvādam umayā saha |*  
*īśvarasya tu devasya mantramārgaṃ vyavasthitam || 4.134 ||*  
*pañcamenaiva vaktreṇa īśānena dvijottamāḥ |*  
*mantrākhyāṃ kathayisyāmi devyāyā gaditaṃ purā || 4.135 ||*

<sup>132</sup> See p. 85 for a detailed presentation.

<sup>133</sup> Contained in *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, ed. Shingo EINOO, 2009, pp. 9–350.

<sup>134</sup> SANDERSON (2009: 201 ff.) puts forward the conceptual edifice of a Śaiva-Brahmanical order—a system that corresponds very closely to the model presented in the *Niśvāsamukha*.



*catuḥsrotā mayā pūrvam śrutā devyāḥ prasādataḥ |*  
*te sarve kathitās tubhyaṃ nissandigdḥā dvijottamāḥ || 4.136 ||*  
*pañcamaṃ tu param srotaṃ śi --- |*

Now, then (*tad ato*), o Brāhmins, the discourse of the god Śiva (*īś-varasya*) with Umā [is as follows]; the Mantramārga is settled with the fifth face, [that is to say] the Īśāna [face], o Brāhmins! I shall tell [you of] the [path] of *mantra* which was formerly related to Devī. I heard [about] the four streams before by the grace of Devī: all those I have told you of, o best of Brāhmins, you who are free of doubt. The fifth is the highest stream, [...]

The process we witness here is a nascent precursor to what came to be known as ‘inclusivism’, a term originally coined by the German scholar Paul HACKER<sup>135</sup> to denote a strategy of ‘subjugation via appropriation’ of other systems of thought and practice. This concept has been refined by a number of subsequent scholars who have shown that, though at first glance marked by tolerance, an ‘inclusivist’ approach to alien systems of thought and practice contains the underhand implication of ‘benign’ annexation. In the *Niśvāsamukha*, the welcoming aspect on the surface level of this approach is well laid out in the following extract:<sup>136</sup>

*prāsādaṃ kārayitvā tu viṣṇuṃ ye sthāpayanti hi || 2.27 ||*  
*viṣṇulokaṃ vrajanty ete modante viṣṇunā saha |*  
*brahmāṇaṃ skandaṃ rudrāṇāṃ gaṇeśaṃ mātaraṃ ravim || 2.28 ||*  
*vahnīm śatakratuṃ yakṣaṃ vāyuṃ dharmmañ jaleśvaram |*  
*yo yasya sthāpanaṃ kuryāt prāsāde tu suśobhane || 2.29 ||*  
*pūjaye parayā bhaktyā so ’mṛto hy asya lokatām | 2.30ab |*

Those who install Viṣṇu, having had a temple constructed [for him], will go to the world of Viṣṇu and rejoice with Him. If someone worships [whomsoever among] Brahmā, Skanda, Rudrāṇī, Gaṇeśa, the Mothers (*mātaram*), Sun, fire, Indra (*śatakratum*), Kubera (*yakṣam*), Vāyu,

<sup>135</sup> Consult HACKER (in OBERHAMMER, ed. 1983: 11–28).

<sup>136</sup> Note that the pluralistic veneer of the inclusivist approach taken in the *Niśvāsamukha* is recurrently accentuated to the effect that further illustrative examples can be easily invoked. Let us consider Devī’s question (3.60) regarding salvific methods, and Śiva’s reply (3.61 ff.), for instance, which is a case in point. As a prelude, Devī asks Śiva:

By resorting to which god will fasting bear great fruit? And how should [the god] be worshipped? Tell [me this] by your grace. (3.60)

In his reply, Śiva does not only refrain from directly claiming a monopoly of authority, nor from demanding the installation of himself as the solitary and exclusive object of worship; he does not even condemn the worship of other godheads, which is a striking feature in itself. Besides Śiva-worship (3.146 ff., 188 ff. and 3.92 ff., 175 ff.), he recommends the worship of different godheads, however, and thus, accepts their (subservient and restricted) authority.

Dharma or Varuṇa (*jaleśvaram*) with highest devotion, having installed them in a beautiful temple, he becomes immortal and [achieves] the world of that [particular deity].

Our contention that the term ‘inclusivism’ is applicable to the approach taken in the *Niśvāsamukha* in particular, and to the Śaiva community at large, is shared by SANDERSON (2009: 301) who contends that the Śaiva ‘attitude’:<sup>137</sup>

elaborated an inclusivist model of revelation that ranked other religious systems as stages of an ascent to liberation in Śaivism.

It is apparent that, in presenting the four ‘lower streams’ as preliminary, foundational tenets of tantric Śaivism, the *Niśvāsamukha* implies their tangential, ancillary position vis-à-vis the more portentous Mantramārga. The tantric ‘path of mantra’, for its part, is expounded at great length in the subsequent volumes of the *Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā*. The *Niśvāsamukha* quite clearly subordinates these supposedly ‘inferior’ belief-structures to the path of tantric Śaivism (as borne out in the following extract):

*laukikaṃ kathitaṃ hy etad vaidikañ cāturāśramam || 1.55 ||*

---|

--- *proktā lokātītā mahāvratāḥ |*

*mantrākhyāś ca tathā śaivā ato ’nye kupathe sthitāḥ || 1.56 ||*

This is what I have taught as Laukika. The four-*āśrama* system is called Vaidika, [...] <sup>138</sup> [...] <sup>139</sup> The world-transcenders are the Mahāvratas and those who are called *mantra*[-path-follower]s are Śaivas. [Any] others apart from these are situated on a wrong path.

If we cast a sober glance at the bottomline mechanics of the argument voiced in the *Niśvāsamukha*, we can swiftly ascertain that some strands of religio-philosophical practice are appropriated into the Śaiva tenet system with the remainder simply

<sup>137</sup> In his recent study, ‘*Unifying Hinduism*’, NICHOLSON (2010: 185) has argued that the term ‘inclusivism’ not only accurately describes the intellectual and spiritual milieu of remote mediæval India, but even forms part and parcel of modern-day ‘Hinduism’:

The word “inclusivism”, popularised in Hindu studies by Paul Hacker, is a better approximate of the process in India by which a multitude of various sects, philosophies, gods, and modes of worship are united under a single overarching concept, whether the late mediæval idea of six *āstika darśanas* [orthodox philosophies] or the modern term Hinduism.

<sup>138</sup> The lost part of the text, with a substantial degree of certainty, must have listed the Sāṅkhya and Yoga streams, which, as we recall, together constitute the Ādhyātmika stream.

<sup>139</sup> In this lacunose section, we should, in all likelihood, expect the term Atimārga to feature in 56a.

being declared invalid. This has the effect that—though presented in the garb of pluralistic open-mindedness—syncretic Śaivism alone remains as the exclusively unmistakable path. Who, we should ask, are these ‘others, situated on a wrong path’ (*anye kupaṭhe sthitāḥ*)? First of all, without mentioning these explicitly, the ‘inclusivistic’ teaching of the *Niśvāsamukha* excludes two well-known religions of India from its ambit of soteriological legitimacy: Buddhism and Jainism.<sup>140</sup> In fact, these two distinguished religions are not mentioned in the ‘revelation of the Five Streams’ in any overt manner. Likewise, the other so-called ‘heterodox’ (lit. *nāstika*) religions are excluded, which to our mind gives credibility to the contention that early Śaivism as presented in the *Niśvāsamukha* developed around the teaching of brahmanical principles. As we shall see below, the *Niśvāsamukha* constitutes an early platform representative of a model that, with varying degrees of intensity, remains an intrinsically operative feature both of modern day ‘Hinduism’ as well as of its antecedent traditions.

### The *Niśvāsamukha* as a precursor to modern ‘Hinduism’

As the reader will know, many a study of the concept of ‘Hinduism’ has been published in recent years, with the consequence that, presently, divergent and conflicting interpretations with regards to the origins of the umbrella-term of ‘Hinduism’ abound.<sup>141</sup> Studies in the pre-colonial religious history of ‘Hinduism’, postcolonial critiques of the term, as well as ‘post-critical’ assessments of the latter offer an initially bewildering multiplicity of perspectives that the neophyte will find difficult to navigate. Peter BISSCHOP<sup>142</sup> relates how we

have gone a long way to show that already prior to the arrival of the British a notion of a ‘unified Hinduism’ had taken shape, even though the term itself may not yet have been in use, and that it is therefore not the British Orientalists who are to be credited with the ‘creation of Hinduism’.

In debating the question of the degree to which the *Niśvāsamukha*’s world-view might foreshadow ‘modern-day Hinduism’, one cannot avoid defining the term ‘Hin-

<sup>140</sup> Von STIETENCROON’S contribution (1995) may be helpful for arriving at a more specific delimitation of which the traditions are that are denied validity. First of all, the primary evidence he consults is more extensive. Secondly, he opts not to view the primary evidence in the context of inclusivism and thereby offers a contrasting interpretation of the nature and the purport of the textual evidence itself. Von STIETENCROON mentions the eleventh-century *Somaśambhupaddhati*’s assigning of religious traditions to different levels, in accordance with their respective levels of attainment, along the path of thirty-six Śaiva *tattvas*. Unsurprisingly, Śaiva texts feature at the apex, yet Buddhists, and Jains still supersede the Śāktas, Smārtas and Naiyāyikas.

<sup>141</sup> See HALBFASS 1997, LORENZEN 1999, SWEETMAN 2001, 2003, NICHOLSON 2010, BISSCHOP 2016, and FISHER 2017.

<sup>142</sup> BISSCHOP 2016: 39.

duism’ more distinctly. As Peter BISSCHOP (2016: 41) noted, one of the pivotal insights we have gained “from the discussion about the origins of the notion of Hinduism as a single religion is that it shows that the British Orientalists were clearly building on earlier notions that had been developed not so much under a colonial regime but by missionaries and ministers who tried to make sense of the, in their eyes, heathen religion they encountered in India.” The early conception of a unified ‘Hinduism’ might well have come about partly as an effect of the interpretative lenses of European visitors and missionaries during the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, all “men of faith, with a strong belief in their own intellectual competence” (*ibid.*). Meanwhile, we should not discard outright the possibility that the concept of a unitary religion concocted by these early pioneers might have in fact been based on at least partially correct assumptions, or might have accurately reflected some traits of a rudimentary self-presentation found among some members of the socio-religious milieu contemporaneous to the alien observer. NICHOLSON (2010: 2), in this regard, presents a balanced account, that echoes our own contention closely:

The idea of Hindu unity is neither a timeless truth nor a fiction wholly invented by the British to regulate and control their colonial subjects.

If, as established, unificatory tendencies in the religious domain in fact predate the orientalist accounts,<sup>143</sup> is it perhaps worthwhile to investigate whether such currents were nascent—or possibly thriving—even prior to the advent of alien missionaries and religious functionaries? Since it is this very question that we seek to answer, we shall take to a somewhat reductionist<sup>144</sup> definition of the term ‘Hinduism’ that sidesteps the complications which early 20<sup>th</sup>-century nationalist innovations, for example, would inject it with. If we relate to it as ‘a spiritual and cultural system marked, *inter alia*, by an inclusivist approach to other religious and cultural systems of thought and practice’, we are capable of explaining how modern-day ‘Hinduism’ functions as an umbrella term that subsumes otherwise mutually exclusive religious models—polytheistic, monotheistic, or pantheist tenet-systems, for

<sup>143</sup> See BISSCHOP (*op. cit.* 41–48) and SWEETMAN (2003) for a clear and pithy presentation of the 17<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> century textual evidence regarding the formation of the concept of a unitary South Asian religion that eventually came to be associated with the term ‘Hinduism’.

<sup>144</sup> For a more intricate discussion of the various religious identities, their group-affiliations, beliefs, corresponding godheads, philosophies, rituals, modes of worship and other distinguishing features, the reader is referred to NICHOLSON (2010: 185 ff.). We are aware that a multiplicity of other, relevant characteristics could have been included in our definition of the term ‘Hinduism’, characteristics that would likewise have remained fundamentally intact for several millennia. One example would be the concept of *sanātana dharma*—supratemporal (lit. ‘eternal’) religion—as opposed to religions ‘established’ at a certain point in time by their respective ‘founder’ (*e.g.* as in Islam). We could also have included the primacy of Śiva and Viṣṇu as supreme deities in our definition of the term ‘Hinduism’, since it is textually attested to in the *Nīśvāsamukha* and likewise persists as a characteristic feature until the present day. Since these aspects are, however, not central to our discussion of inclusivism, they are consciously omitted in our (admittedly functional and minimalistic) definition.

example. This ‘conglomerate entity’ as a new conceptual unit is then contrasted with ‘outside’ systems. Modern day ‘Hinduism’ hence functions as a taxonomical ‘meta-model’ for a diversity of systems in the very same way syncretic Śaivism provided the superstructure for the brahmanical-śaiva hybrid system laid out in the *Niśvāsamukha*. The continuity of the inclusivist model, we argue, persists from its earliest explicit formulations, textually verifiable in the *Niśvāsamukha*, right until the ascent of modern-day ‘Hinduism’ (as we have defined it)—albeit the traction of the inclusivist framework would have fluctuated in accordance with the vagaries of regional and epochal developments.

## Parallels and Borrowings

As already indicated above, the *Niśvāsamukha* seems to be largely dependent on outside sources to create its body of text. We know by now that the *Niśvāsamukha* mentions five religious systems—[1] Laukika, [2] Vaidika, [3] Ādhyātmika, [4] Atimārga, and [5] Mantramārga—and elaborates upon the first four in depth, while only alluding to the fifth. Since the *Niśvāsamukha* concerns itself with the introduction of the first four types of religious systems, it is only natural that it draws from the relevant sources of these systems. Although we do not find parallels to what the *Niśvāsamukha* teaches in all cases, it is likely that in many an instance the *Niśvāsamukha* borrowed from other sources.

A large part of the Laukika section of the *Niśvāsamukha* may have been composed on the basis of previous or contemporaneous sources—we do encounter similar materials in other texts, both Śaiva and non-Śaiva. Thus, the *Aṣṭamūrti* hymn (1.30–41), the list of the *pañcāṣṭaka* (3.19–22), the list of rivers (3.2–8) and the famous *Liṅgodbhava*-myth (1.172–185) are probably not inventions *ex nihilo*, ascribable to the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* alone. The descriptions of the Cāndrāyaṇa (3.43), Yaticāndrāyaṇa (3.45), Śīucāndrāyaṇa observances (3.46), and the names of the ancestors of the four castes (3.155) are borrowed from the *Manusmṛti*.<sup>145</sup> The Vedic section (4.2–41) of the *Niśvāsamukha* as well has partly borrowed from the *Manusmṛti*. As we have discussed above,<sup>146</sup> the Ādhyātmika section, presenting the systems of Sāṅkhya and Yoga, appears to be modelled on the basis of earlier sources that were possibly originally disjunct. The Atimārga sections (the presen-

<sup>145</sup> Likewise, shorter, individual sections incorporated into the fabric of the *Niśvāsamukha* also testify to the fact that the text has drawn from earlier sources: *Niśvāsamukha* 1.167c–168b is exactly paralleled by *Śivadharmasāstra* 1.14c–15b; *Niśvāsamukha* 2.2 is closely paralleled by *Śivadharmasāstra* 3.77c–78b; *Niśvāsamukha* 2.91cd is redolent of *Śivadharmasāstra* 12.72; the notion of a gradation of recipients (*pātra*) in the *Niśvāsamukha* 2.117–19 also appears to have a connection with the account in *Śivadharmasāstra* 7.69–71. (See p. 81 for further details) *Niśvāsamukha* 1.2ab is paralleled by *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* 1.7:180ab and 1.21:170cd, and *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1.6:36ab; *Niśvāsamukha* 1.126c–127b is paralleled by *Skandapurāṇa* 28.31abcd; *Niśvāsamukha* 1.71ab is closely paralleled by *Skandapurāṇa* 27.24ab (See p. 25 above).

<sup>146</sup> Refer to p. 19.

tation of teachings of the Pāñcārthas and Kāpālikas) are also fashioned by drawing from sources pertaining to those traditions.<sup>147</sup>

This fact has significant implications for the way that one should engage with the external source-material which has found its way into the textual fabric of the *Niśvāsamukha*. On the one hand, parallels abound; on the other, borrowed insertions are, more often than not, recontextualised—at times even contorted. In some cases, external sources render the original context of the source material and thereby provide contrasting reference points, against which to gauge the degree of distortion in the corresponding presentation of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

Although it is certainly of value for cultural and religious historians to find that the text of the *Niśvāsamukha* preserves some archaic materials which are otherwise unknown to us, we nevertheless have to tread cautiously in our effort to pursue a balanced and dependable extraction of information from the work. The cosmological system of the Kapālavratins—a division of the archaic Pāśupata branch of Śaivism—is a case in point. On the one hand, the *Niśvāsamukha* is the only existing source to preserve a systematic account of the cosmology of the Kāpālikas (SANDERSON 2006: 163) that we know of; on the other, that very fact makes it nigh-on-impossible to verify the accuracy of the portrayal. We should therefore hesitate to prematurely draw any definite conclusions regarding the ways of the Kāpālikas in particular, and the Pāśupata school at large, based solely on the rendition of the *Niśvāsamukha*.<sup>148</sup>

### Parallels with other Books of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*

Among the textual parallels that we shall examine more closely, let us commence with the *Niśvāsamukha* and the other books of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. We shall begin with the first three *sūtras*: the *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra* and *Nayasūtra*. Com-

<sup>147</sup> There are a few texts that have citable parallels with the *Niśvāsamukha* and that, being unquestionably younger than the *Niśvāsamukha*, we are not going to discuss individually: the division into five streams of knowledge found in *Niśvāsamukha* 1.26c–27b is paralleled in *Pūrvakāṃika* 1.17c–18b; the *Aṣṭamūrti*-hymn in *Niśvāsamukha* 1.32–39 is paralleled in *Prayogamañjarī* 1.19–26, *Tantrasamuccaya* 1.16–23, and *Īśānagurudevapaddhati* 26.56–63; and *Niśvāsamukha* 2.82c–86b is paralleled by *Somaśambhupaddhati* 1.6:5–8, *Kriyākramadyotikā* (§ 67, p.134), and *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* (attributed to *Suprabhedāgama*). While the first two lines (*Niśvāsamukha* 2.82c–83b) are found in the *Jñānaratnāvalī* fol. 126b, the last two lines (*Niśvāsamukha* 2.85c–86b) have also been attributed there to the *Suprabhedāgama* (GOML MS R 14898, p. 144).

<sup>148</sup> On the other hand, the Pāśupatas, and their subschool, the Kāpālikas, as a corollary of being proto-Śaiva groups hence differ inherently less intensely from the ‘new orthodoxy’ advanced in the *Niśvāsamukha* than the brahmanical elements absorbed therein originally did. It might therefore be argued that the account of the Kāpālikas and Pāśupatas in the *Niśvāsamukha* is less likely beset by stark distortion, and one can concede some ground to that objection. Still, we will only be able to ascertain the probity of the descriptions in the *Niśvāsamukha* once further material will have surfaced; after all, we have noted significant alterations elsewhere, e.g. in instances where a supposedly close commentary inverts the taxonomical framework of its reference text. (I am alluding here to the way the *Mṛgendrapaddhatiṭīkā* (T. 1021, pages 217–218) quotes verses 8.78–79 from the *Matanṅga*.)

paring the *Niśvāsamukha* against the bodies of text in these works, it becomes apparent that the *Niśvāsamukha* has no textual parallels in the *Uttarasūtra*, few in the *Mūlasūtra*,<sup>149</sup> some in the *Nayasūtra*, and substantial amounts in the *Guhyasūtra*. As a general rule, these textual parallels, are quite explicit and readily identifiable, although in the section topicizing cosmology, phrasing differs to a wavering degree between the *Mūlasūtra* and the *Niśvāsamukha*.

As we noted, GOODALL presents a well-founded argument regarding the likely chronological order wherein the individual works of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* were probably composed.<sup>150</sup> In theory, this would have allowed us to infer rudimentary generalities with regards to likely directions of borrowing. As the ensuing investigation of textual parallels shall bear out, however, we do not have solid evidence to prove that any of the works within the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*-compendium borrowed from another work of the corpus, one significant instance excluded.<sup>151</sup> As we shall presently attempt to demonstrate, it is much more likely that the works of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*—irrespective of their relative age—have borrowed from outside, antecedent source(s). After all, GOODALL<sup>152</sup> shows “that the sequence of thirty-six *tattvas* may have developed in the *Niśvāsa*-corpus itself, in part by borrowing specifically from the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha*”; therefore a theory based on more widespread borrowing appears not too far fetched.

Let us investigate, first of all, the textual parallels the *Niśvāsamukha* shares with the *Nayasūtra*. The sections on Yoga in the *Niśvāsamukha* (4.50ff) and the *Nayasūtra* (4.105ff) are strikingly alike. The phrase in 4.60ab *pṛthvī kaṭhinarūpeṇa śṛṇu dehe yathā sthitā* in the *Niśvāsamukha* matches the *Nayasūtra*’s verse 2.23 nearly to the letter. Another noteworthy parallel is the list of eight yogic postures in the

<sup>149</sup> For example, the textual basis of the cosmology taught in the *Niśvāsamukha* (4.100 ff.) and the cosmology of the *Mūlasūtra* (5.3 ff.) are quite akin. GOODALL (2016: 106–8) notes that the cosmology presented in the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* was not originally uniform (p. 106), since “there were (at least) two different early tantric extensions of the Sāṅkhyas’ *tattvakrama*”, and that the account displayed in the work was hence gradually conceived. In sum, GOODALL shows that

what the testimony of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* shows is that even some of those theological features of the Śaivasiddhānta which we have become accustomed to thinking of as defining characteristics of the religion were either absent entirely in early times (e.g. *āṇava-mala*) or have been evolving steadily (the *tattvakrama*, the *bhuvanakrama*).

<sup>150</sup> Refer to footnote 57 on page 30.

<sup>151</sup> As we shall see at a slightly later stage (p. 65), it appears that the author—or editor—of the *Niśvāsamukha* might have played a role in the redaction of chapter sixteen of the *Guhyasūtra*, the section where the Kedāra myth is expounded. In that specific instance, we hold, textual borrowing could have occurred between those two works of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*-compendium.

<sup>152</sup> GOODALL 2016: 108.

*Niśvāsamukha* and the *Nayasūtra*. By name, these are: Svastika, Padmaka, Bhadra, Ardhacandra, Prasārita, Sāpāśraya, Añjalika and Yogapaṭṭa.

The verse which records this list in the *Niśvāsamukha* (4.50) reads:

*svastikaṃ padmakaṃ bhadraṃ tv arddhacandraṃ prasāritam |*  
*sāpāśrayam añjalikaṃ yogapaṭṭam yathāsukham ||*

After facing north and then assuming a yogic posture, [such as one of the following:] [1] *svastika*, [2] the lotus-posture (*padmaka*), [3] *bhadra*, [4] *arddhacandra*, [5] *prasārita*, [6] *sāpāśraya*, [7] *añjalika*, [8] *yogapaṭṭa*, in whatever posture is comfortable [for him] ....

The corresponding verse in the *Nayasūtra* (4.14c–15b) is almost identical:<sup>153</sup>

*svastikaṃ padmakaṃ bhadram arddhacandraṃ prasāritam ||*  
*sāpāśrayam añjalikaṃ yogapaṭṭam yathāsukham |*

‘The *svastika*, the lotus-posture (*padmaka*), the *bhadra*, the half-moon posture (*arddhacandra*), the stretched out posture (*prasārita*), the back-rest-assisted posture (*sāpāśrayam*), the *añjalika*, the yoga-band[-assisted] posture (*yogapaṭṭam*), at ease .... GOODALL et al. (2015: 469)

The only difference is that where the *Nayasūtra* reads *arddhacandram*, the *Niśvāsamukha* reads *tv arddhacandram*. In this context, *Niśvāsamukha* 4.65c–66d and *Nayasūtra* 3.21c–22d<sup>154</sup> may also serve as evidence for the definite affinity between the two texts. Since this is a well-known list of yogic postures that would be textually rendered in other sources, it is possible that both texts have borrowed it from another source or from two different sources.

The descriptions of *prāṇāyāma* in the *Niśvāsamukha* and in the *Nayasūtra*<sup>155</sup> are also closely related. We see that both texts teach three types of *prāṇāyāma*: *kumbhaka*, *recaka* and *pūraka*. The definitions of *kumbhaka*, *recaka* and *pūraka* are fundamentally the same in both texts, the *Niśvāsamukha*’s being more elaborate and the *Nayasūtra*’s more concise. Further, there are two additional categories

<sup>153</sup> Later on, the *Nayasūtra* presents the eight yogic postures in a slightly different phrasing: *āsanaṃ padmakaṃ baddhvā svastikaṃ bhadracandrakam | sāpāśrayam yogapaṭṭam āsīnaṃ ca yathāsukham ||* 4.105 ||.

<sup>154</sup> The *Niśvāsamukha*’s version runs as follows: *divyadr̥ṣṭiḥ prajāyeta yadā tanmayatāṇ gataḥ || sarvavidyāḥ pravartante sarvaṃ pratyakṣato bhavet | siddhaiś ca saha saṃbhāṣaṃ yadā tanmayatāṇ gataḥ ||*. The version of the *Nayasūtra*, in turn, is constituted thus: *siddhaś caiva svatantraś ca divyasr̥ṣṭiḥ prajāyate || śaṇmāsād dhyānayogena divyasiddhiḥ prajāyate | trailokye yaḥ pravartteta pratyakṣan tasya jāyate ||*.

<sup>155</sup> The rendition in the *Niśvāsamukha* displays *prāṇāyāmaṃ pravakṣyāmi trīṣprakāraṃ samabhyaset ||* 4.54 || *virecyāpūrya saṃruddhaṃ kumbhakaṃ parikīrttitam | pūrayec ca svakaṃ dehaṃ yāvad āpūritam bhavet ||* 4.55 || *pūrakas tu samākhyāto prāṇāyāmo dvitīyakaḥ | niṣkrāmayati yo vāyuraṃ sva[dehā] --- ||* 4.56 || *sa recakas samākhyātaḥ prāṇāyāmas tṛtīyakaḥ ||* 4.57ab. The *Nayasūtra*’s version is as follows: *recaṇāt pūraṇād rodhāt prāṇāyāmas trayas smṛtaḥ |* 4.111ab.



relating to *prāṇāyāma* taught in the *Nayasūtra*: external and internal.<sup>156</sup> The *Naya-sūtra* (4.113d) states that the internal *prāṇāyāma* is of four kinds, the fourth being *supraśānta*—this detail is not found in the *Niśvāsamukha*, despite the latter’s generally more exhaustive treatment of the matter.

However, we do find a close connection between these two texts in the section on *dhāraṇā*, ‘fixation.’ *Niśvāsamukha* 4.57c–61 teaches four types of fixation, in the following order: those of air, fire, earth, and water. The *Nayasūtra*, for its part, teaches five types of *dhāraṇā*, which sequentially are defined as those of air, fire, earth, water and ether.<sup>157</sup> Both texts show their account of meditative fixation relating to the same first four elements, but the *Nayasūtra* adds ‘ether’. With this unusual sequence, these two texts stand apart from other Śaiva sources.<sup>158</sup>

Another topic treated by both texts in their yoga-section, and commonly taught in the Śaiva yoga system, is *karāṇa*. *Karāṇa* is a technical term for what the yogin does with his upper body once his lower limbs have assumed a yogic posture and he is about to engage in the practice of *prāṇāyāma* (‘breath control’).<sup>159</sup> What is taught in the *Niśvāsamukha* (4.51) and in the *Nayasūtra* (4.106ab) is effectively the same procedure; the wording of the verses differs slightly, with neither text employing the term *karāṇa*.<sup>160</sup>

Cosmographical descriptions are also shared by the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Guhyasūtra*, including accounts of the forty Śaiva sites with corresponding homonymous heavens known as the *pañcāṣṭaka*, the ‘five ogdoads’, which seem closely related. It is striking, for instance, that *Niśvāsamukha* 3.22ab is hypermetrical, as is the corresponding hemistich of *Guhyasūtra* 7.116ab. Both texts present their listings of these places in congruence with regard even to the order of the individual items, with only negligible variation in the names: *Niśvāsamukha* 3.23a calls one world *vastrāpada*, while the corresponding reading of the *Guhyasūtra* (7.117c) is *bhadrāpada*. *Vastrāpada* is attested in a wide range of relevant sources, such as *Mahābhārata* 3.80:108b, *Svacchandatantra* 10.887a *Īśānagurudevapaddhati* 17.197, and *Uttarakāmika* 23.136. The occurrence of *bhadrāpada* as a place particularly sacred to Śiva and his followers, however, is not. We assume therefore that the list of the *Guhyasūtra* in this instance must have been subjected to (wilful or inadvertent) corruption. Although *vastrāpada* transpires in many sources, the original name might have been

<sup>156</sup> *Nayasūtra* 4.111cd: *sāmānyād bahir etāni punaś cābhyantarāṇi ca* ||.

<sup>157</sup> *Nayasūtra* 4.115–116: *vāyavīn dhāraye ’ṛiguṣṭhe āgneyīm nābhimadhyataḥ | mājendriṇ kaṇṭhadeśe tu vāruṇīm ghaṇṭikeṣu ca* || 4.115 || *ākāśadhāraṇā mūrdhni sarvasiddhikarī smṛtā | ekadvitrīṣcatuḥpañca udghātaiś ca prasiddhyati* || 4.116 ||.

<sup>158</sup> We find a different sequence of meditative fixation taught in *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 7.6–10, *Svāyaṃbhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha* 20.4–28, *Mataṅgayogapāda* 35c–65, *Kiraṇa* 58.18c–26b, etc., which follow instead this order: fire, water, sovereign (*iśa*) and nectar (*amṛta*). For more details, see TAK3 s.v. *dhāraṇā*.

<sup>159</sup> See TAK2 s.v. *karāṇa* for further details.

<sup>160</sup> The *Niśvāsamukha* runs as follows: *baddhvā yogāsanam samyak ṛjukāyaḥ samāhitāḥ | jihvān tu tāluke nyasya dantair dantān na saṃsprśet* ||; and the *Nayasūtra*: *tālujihvo dantāsparśī samako nāsadrṣṭigah* |.

Bhastrāpada,<sup>161</sup> although it occurs only in a handful of sources, such as *Skandapurāṇa* 125-128, *Śivadharmasāstra* 12.108a,<sup>162</sup> and *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* 7.22a. For the *Śivadharmasāstra*'s testimony concerning the form of this toponym we consulted two early Nepalese witnesses—one<sup>163</sup> records *bhastrāpada* whereas the other<sup>164</sup> has *vastrāpada*. To many South Asian ears these words are almost homophonous, and this no doubt explains the discrepancy in transmission.<sup>165</sup> Many further such instances of small variation occur: where the *Niśvāsamukha* (3.25b) reads *thaleśvara*, the *Guhyasūtra* (7.120d) attests to *sthaleśvara*. This seems again an insignificant variation, *thaleśvara* being a local variant attributable to the regional pronunciation in the mind(s) of the scribe(s).

All in all, the *Guhyasūtra* follows standard orthography more closely than the *Niśvāsamukha*. It is, however, not always the case that the readings of the *Guhyasūtra* are consistently superior to those of the *Niśvāsamukha*. For instance, in the case of *amrātikeśvara*, the *Guhyasūtra* seems to attest to *ambrātikeśvara*, which has been emended to *amrātikeśvara* (see below)—which is the reading the *Niśvāsamukha* provides. As the *pañcāṣṭaka* is a common topic in Śaiva sources, this list, shared by both texts, does not entitle us to conclude that the *Niśvāsamukha* borrowed this textual portion from the *Guhyasūtra*. It appears more likely that both texts are dependent on an earlier, most probably non-tantric, Śaiva work for the provision of this list. If we are right in our interpretation, in borrowing the list from an earlier, external source, the *Guhyasūtra* adds an extra hemistich, marked in bold, as the concluding remark for each group of eight. This is done in order to summarize the soteriological significance of each ogdoad in the context of Śaiva cosmology. We present the two lists juxtaposed below:

NIŚVĀSAMUKHA 3.19–25

*amareśaṃ prabhāsañ ca*  
*naimiṣaṃ puṣkaran tathā |*  
*āṣāḍhan diṇḍimuṇḍiñ ca*  
*bhārabhūtiñ ca lākulim ||*

GUHYASŪTRA 7.112–121

*amareśaṃ prabhāsañ ca*  
*naimiṣaṃ puṣkaran tathā |*  
*āṣāḍhin diṇḍimuṇḍiñ ca*  
*bhārabhūtiṃ salākulim ||*  
**pratyātmike mṛtā ye tu**  
**te vrajanty eva tatpadam |**  
 pratyātmike ] conj.; pratyātmikā  
 NKW

<sup>161</sup> BISSCHOP 2006: 31 and 186.

<sup>162</sup> Refer to the Nepalese manuscript with the reel № B 7/3, fol. 44v. line: 4.

<sup>163</sup> A 1028/4, fol. 46v. line 4.

<sup>164</sup> A 1082/3, fol. 40v. line 4.

<sup>165</sup> Hans BAKKER, in a personal communication dated 16th of October 2015, noted that a “similar variant is found in *Mahābhārata* 3.80.108b, where the critical text has *Vastrāpada* (with wriggle), while the Southern Recension has *Bhadrāpada* (not *Bhastrāpada*)”. He further remarks: “*Bhastrāpada* is only found in the *Śivadharmasāstra*, the *Skandapurāṇa*, and some pre-angorean inscriptions”, for which reason the original name “might indeed have been *Bhastrāpada*. But this name, ‘original’ or not, is not found in the *Guhyasūtra*, nor in the *Niśvāsamukha*”.

*hariścandraṃ paraṃ guhyaṃ  
guhyaṃ madhyamakeśvaram |*

*śrīparvataṃ samākhyātāñ  
jalpeśvaram ataḥ param ||*

*amrātikeśvarañ caiva  
mahākālan tathaiva ca |*

*kedāram uttamañ guhyaṃ  
mahābhairavam eva ca ||*

*gayāñ caiva kurukṣetraṃ  
nakhalan kanakhalan tathā |*

*vimalaṃ cāṭṭahāsaṃ ca  
māhendram bhīmam aṣṭamam ||*

*vastrāpadaṃ rudrakoṭim  
avimuktam mahābalaṃ |*

*hariścandraṃ paraṃ guhyaṃ  
guhyaṃ madhyamakeśvaram ||*  
guhyaṃ guhyaṃ ] K; guhyaṃ guhya°  
NW

*śrīparvataṃ samākhyātāñ  
jalpeśvaram ataḥ param |*  
jalpeśvaram ataḥ ] N; jāleśvaram ataḥ  
K; jalpaśvaram ataḥ W

*amrātikeśvaraṃ caiva  
mahākālaṃ tathaiva ca ||*  
amrātikeśvaraṃ ] em.; ambrā --- N;  
amdhrā □ K; ambrātike □ W,  
mahākālaṃ ] em.; mahākāla NW;  
mahākālas K

*kedāram uttamaṃ guhyaṃ  
mahābhairavam eva ca |*  
guhyaṃ ] NW; śuddhaṃ K  
***guhyāṣṭake mṛtā ye tu  
te vrajantīha tatpadam ||***

*gayāñ caiva kurukṣetran  
nakhalaṃ kanakhalan tathā |*  
gayāñ caiva ] NW; gayā caiva K

*vimalaṃ cāṭṭahāsaṃ ca  
māhendram bhīmam aṣṭamam ||*  
***atiguhye mṛtā ye tu  
atiguhyam vrajanti te |***  
te ] NW; ca K

*bhadrāpadaṃ rudrakoṭim  
avimuktaṃ mahābalaṃ ||*  
rudrakoṭim avimuktaṃ ] em.;  
rudrakoṭim avimukta NW; rudrakoṭi  
avimuktaṃ K

*gokarṇaṃ bhadraḥkarṇaṃ ca  
svarṇākṣaṃ sthāṇum aṣṭamam ||*

*chagalaṇḍaṃ dviraṇḍaṃ ca  
mākoṭaṃ maṇḍaleśvaram |  
kālañjaraṃ samākhyātaṃ  
devadāruvanan tathā ||*

*śaṅkukarṇaṇan tathaiveha  
thaleśvaram ataḥ param |  
snānadarsānapūjābhīr  
mucyate sarvakilbiṣaiḥ ||*

*gokarṇaṃ rudrakarṇaṇaṃ ca  
svarṇākṣaṃ sthāṇur aṣṭamam |  
gokarṇaṃ bhadraḥkarṇaṃ ] em.;  
gokarṇa --- karṇaṇ NW; gokarṇa  
rudrakarṇaṇ K, svarṇākṣaṃ sthāṇur  
aṣṭamam ] em.; svarṇa --- raṣṭamam  
NK; svarṇa ⊔ raṣṭamam W  
**eteṣv api mṛtās samyag  
bhittvā lokam aśeṣataḥ |**  
*dīpyamānās tu gacchanti  
atra sthāṇeṣu ye mṛtāḥ |**

*chagalaṇḍaṃ dviraṇḍaṃ ca  
mākoṭaṃ maṇḍaleśvaram ||  
kālañjaraṃ samākhyātan  
devadāruvanan tathā |*

*śaṅkukarṇaṇan tathaiveha  
sthaleśvaram ataḥ param ||  
**eteṣv api mṛtā ye tu  
bhittvā lokam aśeṣataḥ |**  
*dīpyamānās tu gacchanti  
sthānāṣṭakam idaṃ priye ||  
sthānāṣṭakam idaṃ ] em.; sthā --- mi-  
dam NK; sthāṇva ⊔ W**

The list of the *pañcāṣṭaka* in the *Niśvāsamukha* appears in the Laukika section, more precisely, the section wherein the text conveys the religious duties of uninitiated lay followers. The locations listed in connection with the *pañcāṣṭaka* clearly correspond to famous Śaiva pilgrimage sites. As we can see from the extract above, the listing of the ‘five sets of eight’ as they are displayed in the *Niśvāsamukha* does not provide the names for each group of eight; conversely, they do feature in the case of the *Guhyasūtra*<sup>166</sup> and in other significant Śaiva tantric works (in *Svāyaṃbhuvā-sūtrasaṅgraha* 4.47–55, for example). The list in the *Niśvāsamukha*, however, does display the epithets ‘most secret’ (*paraṃ guhyaṃ*) in reference to Hariścandra; Madhyamakeśvara, in turn, is referred to as secret (*guhyaṃ*).<sup>167</sup> Further, Kedāra and Mahābhairava are here given the epithet ‘extreme[ly] secret’ (*uttamaṃ guhyaṃ*).<sup>168</sup>

<sup>166</sup> Each ogdoad in the *Guhyasūtra* (7.123–124) has been assigned its particular name: *pratyātmika*, *guhya*, *atiguhya*, *pavitra*, and *sthāṇu*.

<sup>167</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* 3.20 ff. HansBAKKER, in a personal communication dated 16 October 2015, opined that the use of the terms (*guhyaṃ*, *paraṃ guhyaṃ* and *uttamaṃ guhyaṃ*) might not refer to any further, particular group of sites, but instead reflects a more generic use which is employed merely to emphasize the *gravitas* of the sites they already qualify.

<sup>168</sup> Hans BAKKER, (*ibid.*), notified us that “*Guhyasūtra* 7.115a does not qualify Kedāra as

Regarding the direction of borrowing amongst the two works, Hans BAKKER argued, in short, that the author of the *Guhyasūtra* must have borrowed the list from the *Niśvāsamukha*, adding hemistiches<sup>169</sup> after the description of each ogdoad; he would have done so in order to recast the original list in accordance with the dogmatic particularities of the *Guhyasūtra*. But we suspect that the *Guhyasūtra* did not borrow this list from the *Niśvāsamukha*, since there is evidence to suggest that the *Guhyasūtra* may have been composed before the *Niśvāsamukha*.

We base this contention regarding the relative dating on the grounds that the *Guhyasūtra* (1.1–4) considers the compendium to be complete (*saṃpūrṇa*) without the *Niśvāsamukha*, which is therein described as merely ‘informing’ or ‘complementing’ (*puṣṭa*) the *Niśvāsa*-corpus. This would mean that the *Guhyasūtra* antedates the *Niśvāsamukha*, which in turn indicates that at a previous stage, the *Niśvāsa*-compendium would have consisted of the *Guhyasūtra* and the other three *sūtras* alone. This is all the more plausible if we remember that the *Guhyasūtra* and the other three *sūtras* have tantric content and are hence also topically distinct from the *Niśvāsamukha*. What is more, as we have seen above, the references to the *Niśvāsamukha* in the *Guhyasūtra* are situated at the very beginning and end of the latter and are therefore likely to be later insertions included with the intent to craft a retroactive link between the *Niśvāsamukha* and the other books of the *Niśvāsa*-corpus.

There is an additional line at the end of the section in the *Niśvāsamukha* (3.25cd) which reminds us of the pre-tantric connotations of the *pañcāṣṭaka*. The writer of this line does not appear to regard these places as counterparts to the respective Śaiva worlds (*bhuvana*) known, from a list of cosmic correlatives, by the same name: *snānadarśanapūjābhīr mucyate sarvakilbiṣaiḥ* ‘by bathing, beholding or performing worship [there] one becomes free from all sins.’ Immediately after that (*Niśvāsamukha* 3.26), however, the text suggests that the divine ogdoads (*pañcāṣṭaka*) are located above the egg of Brahmā (*brahmāṇḍa*). It also mentions that those who die in one of the pilgrimage sites of the worldly *pañcāṣṭaka* will proceed to the corresponding world of the same name in the divine *pañcāṣṭaka*, from which they shall not have to return.<sup>170</sup> Thereby a correlation is established of the earthly

---

*atiguhyā*—indeed one of the five names of the ogdoads—but as *uttamaṃ guhyam*.” Yet we would like to point out that the *Śivadharmasāstra* lists the five sets of ogdoads with specific naming (see BISSCHOP 2006: 30–32).

<sup>169</sup> *Guhyasūtra* 7.113ab, 115cd, 117ab, and 118cd–119ab. Hans BAKKER, however, (*ibid.*), conveyed his belief that the *Guhyasūtra* is the younger text, and that its redactor might also have recast individual portions of the *Niśvāsamukha* to streamline it in deference to the profile of ideas expressed in the *Guhyasūtra*. In his own words, he deems it more

likely that the hemistiches given in bold in *Guhyasūtra* 7.113ab, 115cd, 117ab, and 118cd–119ab ..., which are missing in the *Mukha* text, are additions through which the author of the *Guhyasūtra* adapted the *Mukha* text to the later doctrine.

<sup>170</sup> Cf., for example in *Guhyasūtra* 7.113ab.

pilgrimage sites known as the *pañcāṣṭaka* with the cosmic *pañcāṣṭaka*.<sup>171</sup> The textual evidence for a connection between cosmic and earthly pilgrimage sites in the *Niśvāsamukha* is briefer than the more elaborate presentation in the *Guhyasūtra*, yet it is no less explicit.<sup>172</sup>

The extra lines inserted at the end of each group of eight in the extract of the *Guhyasūtra* above also reflects the correlation of the divine *pañcāṣṭakas* with their forty mundane counterparts. For instance, explaining the properties of the first group, the text mentions: *pratyātmike mṛtā ye tu te vrajanty eva tatpadam* ‘whoever dies in [the fivefold set of eight known as] Pratyātmikā certainly ventures forth to the corresponding world.’ Thus, the five ogdoads, as presented in the context of the *Guhyasūtra*, reflect a tantric view of the cosmos. The *Guhyasūtra* itself, however, cannot readily be credited with incorporating these ogdoads into Śaiva cosmology. In our view, the Lokātīta-Pāśupatas<sup>173</sup> are more likely to have been the first to propel this development; only thereafter did the followers of the Mantramārga proceeded to gradually integrate these places in their cosmology.<sup>174</sup>

In this vein, it is to be noted that the *Śivadharmasāstra*<sup>175</sup> also records a list of *pañcāṣṭaka*, albeit with some variation in naming. The list in the *Śivadharmasāstra* likewise refers to the pilgrimage centres and in like manner provides a label for each group.<sup>176</sup>

Another significant point of topical overlap between the *Niśvāsamukha* and the

<sup>171</sup> The *Guhyasūtra*, for its part, gives a detailed presentation of a fully developed hierarchy of cosmic counterparts to the earthly *pañcāṣṭakas*.

<sup>172</sup> *gacchanti bhūtvā brahmāṇḍam eṣu sthāneṣu ye mṛtāḥ | pañcāṣṭakam idan divyaṃ yaṃ gattvā na nivartate ||* 3.26 ||. ‘Those who die in these places ascend, penetrating the [shell of the] egg of Brahṁā (*brahmāṇḍam*), to [the respective world in] this divine set of five groups of eight [worlds bearing the same names as the pilgrimage sites], upon reaching which (*yaṃ gatvā*) he will not be reborn [in this world].’

<sup>173</sup> Presented in *Niśvāsamukha* 4.88ff.

<sup>174</sup> The Śaiva cosmos begins with the world of Kālāgnirudra and reaches up to the *parama* (‘highest’) Śiva, that is to say: the ultimate reality in and of the system (*Mūlasūtra* 5.1–2). Dominic GOODALL defines the structure of Śaiva cosmology (email of 5th November 2014) as follows:

The Śaiva cosmology is the ‘order of the universe’ according to the Śaivas. In other words, it refers to the levels of hells, *pātālas* ‘netherworlds’ and other *bhuvanas* ‘worlds’ that are described, for instance in chapter 5 of the *Parākhya*, or chapter 8 of the *Kiraṇa*, or chapters 4–7 of the *Guhyasūtra*, or chapter 10 of the *Svacchanda*. Some people might prefer to refer to a Śaiva cosmography, a description of the cosmos. What makes it Śaiva is that no other group makes the claim that the universe has quite this shape. The Purāṇic cosmography, for example, is much more limited, since it restricts itself to the *brahmāṇḍa* ‘egg of Brahṁā.’

<sup>175</sup> *Śivadharmasāstra* 12.108 ff (A 1082/3, fol. 40v4–41r2). Refer to p. 86.

<sup>176</sup> Note that BISSCHOP (2006: 27–28) argues that this list may represent an archaic phase of its history.

*Guhyasūtra* is the praise of qualities ascribed to the pilgrimage site of Kedāra. The *Niśvāsamukha* (3.28a–29a) presents it thus:

*kedārodakapānāc ca gatim pañcāṣṭamīm dhruvam |*  
*vidyayā saṃyutā ye tu pibante ca jalam śubham ||*  
*śivasāyojyatām yānti |*

Also, by drinking the water of Kedāra one certainly obtains the realm of rebirth of (*gatim*) [of attaining] the five sets of ogdoads (i.e. all forty *bhuvanas*) (*pañcāṣṭamīm*). As for those who possess (*saṃyutāḥ*) the Vidyāmantra (*vidyayā*) and who drink [this] pure water [of Kedāra], they will obtain (*yānti*) union with Śiva.

The *tīrtha* Kedāra occurs twice in the *Niśvāsamukha*: once in the list of forty sacred places (3.21) and once at this point (3.28), where drinking the water of Kedāra is emphasised: ‘those who possess (*saṃyutāḥ*) the Vidyāmantra (*vidyayā*) and who drink [this] pure water [of Kedāra] will obtain (*yānti*) union with Śiva.’ The Vidyāmantra, in all likelihood, refers to the ten-syllable *vidyāmantra* (also referred to as Daśākṣaradeva) taught in chapter 16 of the *Guhyasūtra*.<sup>177</sup> This implies that the Laukika teaching of the *Niśvāsamukha* is partly infused with knowledge of the Mantramārgic teachings. This suspicion hardens when considering the account of Kedāra as presented in the *Guhyasūtra*:

*ṛṣaya ū*<sup>178</sup> |  
*devadāruvane ramye*<sup>179</sup> *ṛṣayaḥ saṃśītavratāḥ |*  
*nandīśam upasaṃgamya praṇipatya muhur muhuḥ || 16.1 ||*  
*ūcus te ṛṣayaḥ sarve stutvā nandim*<sup>180</sup> *śivātmajam |*  
*sarvadharmātiriktaḥ tu kedāras tu katham bhavet || 16.2 ||*  
*utpattiṃ ca vidhānaṃ ca pītasyaiva tu yat phalam |*  
*kedārasya samāsenā tattvato vaktum arhasi*<sup>181</sup> || 16.3 ||  
*nandir uvāca |*  
*himavacchikharāsinaṃ deva[[devaṃ jagadgurum]] |*  
*brahmādyādisurāḥ sarve saṃsārābhayaṇīḍitāḥ || 16.4 ||*  
*śaraṇaṃ śaṃkaraṃ jagmuḥ*<sup>182</sup> *stutvā ca vividhaiḥ stavaiḥ |*  
*padbhyaṃ nīpatitāḥ sarve kṛtvā cāñjalisaṃpuṭam*<sup>183</sup> || 16.5 ||  
*vijñāpayam haraṃ caivam*<sup>184</sup> *sarve tatra divaukasāḥ*<sup>185</sup> |

<sup>177</sup> For a summary of the legend, see also TAK 3, s.v. *daśākṣara*.

<sup>178</sup> ṛṣaya ū ] conj.; ṛ--- NW; □ K

<sup>179</sup> devadāruvane ramye ] conj.; ---mmye N; □ msK; ṛ □ W

<sup>180</sup> nandim ] K; nandi° NW

<sup>181</sup> vaktum arhasi ] K; vāktum arhasi NW

<sup>182</sup> śaṃkaraṃ jagmuḥ ] KW; śaṃkaraṃ jagmuḥ N

<sup>183</sup> cāñjalisaṃpuṭam ] WK<sup>pc</sup>; cāñjalisaṃpuṭam N; cāñjalisaṃpuṭam K<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>184</sup> vijñāpayam haraṃ caivam ] W; vijñāpayam haran cevaṃ N; vijñāpayam haraṃ tvevaṃ K

<sup>185</sup> divaukasāḥ ] W; divaukasā N; divaukasāḥ K

*yā te rudra śivā mūrṭiḥ sā katham prāpyate vibho*<sup>186</sup> || 16.6 ||  
*aśivaiś ca suraiḥ sarvair brahmaviṣṇupurogamaiḥ |*  
*tataś ca sa haro devaḥ*<sup>187</sup> ((sa)) --- [[kā]]*rakaḥ*<sup>188</sup> || 16.7 ||  
*vi[[dyayā (saṃ)]]puṭam retam surāṇām agratas tyajan*<sup>189</sup> |  
*bho surendrā pibasvedaṃ*<sup>190</sup> *reta vidyāsamanvitam* || 16.8 ||  
*mama retasya pānena śivatvam prāpyate dhruvam |*  
*etac chrutvā tu vacanam*<sup>191</sup> *sarve tatra divaukasāḥ*<sup>192</sup> || 16.9 ||  
*prādudruvan*<sup>193</sup> *tataḥ sarve apītvā tu tadāmṛtam |*  
*devīm*<sup>194</sup> *mām ca bravīd devo pāsyatām jalam uttamam* || 16.10 ||  
*na ca devī pibet tat tu* ---<sup>195</sup> |  
 --- ((vet)) |  
*aham eva hi pāsyāmi devī vacanam abravīt* || 16.11 ||  
*nandi nandi mahāprajñā*<sup>196</sup> *rakṣasva -m- amṛtam*<sup>197</sup> *jalam |*  
*na deyaṃ devatānām tu naitat pānam kadācana*<sup>198</sup> || 16.12 ||  
*mānuṣā[[nugra(haṃ kāryaṃ paśupakṣi)]]mṛgādiṣu*<sup>199</sup> |  
*vidyāhīnā gaṇeśās*<sup>200</sup> *ca sāyojyaṃ vidyayā yutāḥ*<sup>201</sup> || 16.13 ||

In the beautiful Devadāru forest, the sages [who abided] under stringent vows approached Nandīśa and prostrated [before him] again and again. All the sages, having first praised Nandi, a son of Śiva, asked: “how is it that Kedāra is excelling over all *dharma*s? What is the origin [of its water], what is the [proper] procedure for drinking it and what is the result of drinking it? Pray tell [us all] about Kedāra in brief.” Nandi replied: “All the foremost gods, beginning with Brahmā, oppressed by fear of the world, sought refuge with Śaṅkara, god of gods, [and] teacher of the world, who was sitting at the top of the snow[-capped] mountain. The [gods] praised [Śaṅkara] with various panegyrics, [and then,] folding

<sup>186</sup> mūrṭiḥ sā katham prāpyate vibho ] *em.*; mūrṭti sā katham prāpyate vibhoḥ N; mūrṭti sā katham prāpyate vibho KW  
<sup>187</sup> devaḥ ] K; deva NW  
<sup>188</sup> kārakaḥ ] K; --- N; dārakaḥ W  
<sup>189</sup> °gratas tyajan ] *conj.*; °gratas tyajat N; °gratas tyajet KW  
<sup>190</sup> surendrā pibasvedaṃ reta ] NW; surendrāḥ pibasvedaṃ retam K  
<sup>191</sup> vacanam sarve ] NW; sarve K  
<sup>192</sup> divaukasāḥ ] NW; divaukasah K  
<sup>193</sup> prādudruvan ] *conj.*; prādudruvan NKW  
<sup>194</sup> devīm ] K; devī NW  
<sup>195</sup> pibet tat tu ] W; pibe --- N; pibet ta ⊔ K  
<sup>196</sup> mahāprajñā ] K; mahāprajñā NW  
<sup>197</sup> amṛtam ] NW; amṛtam K  
<sup>198</sup> kadācana ] KW; kadācanaḥ N  
<sup>199</sup> mānuṣānugrahaṃ kāryaṃ paśupakṣimṛgādiṣu ] K; mānuṣā — ga — m --- mṛgādiṣu N;  
 mānuṣānugrahaṃ kṛtvā tathā pakṣimṛgādiṣu W  
<sup>200</sup> gaṇeśās ca ] N; gaṇegaṇeśās ca K; gaṇeśās ca W  
<sup>201</sup> yutāḥ ] K<sup>pc</sup>; yatā NW; yutām K<sup>ac</sup>



their hands, they all fell at his feet. Then, introducing [themselves] to Hara, the gods [asked]: ‘how can, o Rudra, [oneness with] your peaceful form be attained by all [us] anxious gods, headed by Brahmā and Viṣṇu?’ Then the god Hara [answered] [...] discharging [his] semen, concealed by the Vidyā-[mantra], in front of the gods: ‘o excellent gods! Drink this [thus] connected with the Vidyā-[mantra]. By drinking my semen, [you] certainly [will] attain Śiva-hood.’ As soon as they heard this instruction, all the gods flew away from there without drinking that nectar. God said to Devī and me: ‘†Drink [this] excellent water; Devī may not drink it [...].’ †Devī said the [following] words: ‘I myself drink this [semen].’ [Then the god said:] ‘o Nandi of great intelligence! Protect [this] water, [this] nectar. [You] should never give this water to gods. [You] should [instead] favour human beings, domesticated animals, birds, and forest animals. [All who drink this water] without possessing the Vidyāmantra (*vidyayā*), [will become] lords of the Gaṇas. As for those who possess the Vidyāmantra (*vidyayā*), they will attain oneness [with me].’”

Particularly telling of a certain degree of Laukika-Mantramārga syncretism is the following extract from *Guhyasūtra* 16.15:

*vidyāyā lakṣaṇaṃ vakṣye yathāha parameśvaraḥ |*  
*nyāsapānavidhānaṃ ca vidyāmāhātmyam eva ca ||*

I will relate [to you] a description of the Vidyā-[mantra] as the highest god related it [to me], the *nyāsa* procedure [relating to the mantra], the procedure for drinking the [Kedāra water] and also the greatness of the Vidyā-[mantra].

If we consider the above extracts in conjunction with *Niśvāsamukha* 3.28–29b, it appears possible that chapter sixteen of the *Guhyasūtra* influenced the *Niśvāsamukha*, specifically because of the tantric influence on a principally Laukika segment.<sup>202</sup> The *Niśvāsamukha* might have borrowed from the *Guhyasūtra* the idea of achieving union with Śiva by means of the Vidyāmantra and by drinking the Kedāra water.

It is conceivable that a late author/editor was involved *both* in the redaction of the *Niśvāsamukha*, as well as in the generation of the final chapters of the *Guhyasūtra*, chapter sixteen in particular:<sup>203</sup> rather than remoulding either text to fit the

<sup>202</sup> There is a further instance where the text of the *Niśvāsamukha* appears to be influenced by the tantric teachings, viz. *Niśvāsamukha* 1.27c–28b: (*dikṣitā nandinā sarve nirvāṇe yojitāḥ pare || vidyābhikāṅkṣiṇaś cānye vidyāyāṃ te tu yojitāḥ |*). These two lines appear just after Nandin names the Five Streams (1.26a–27a) and states two types of initiation, *vidyādikṣā* and *nirvāṇādikṣā*, which actually fall under the fifth stream, the Mantramārga.

<sup>203</sup> The *Guhyasūtra* may quite possibly contain a multiplicity of textual layers, in which case a number of authors may have been involved in the composition of a text that in its youngest version eventually came to span eighteen chapters. Consult GOODALL et al. (2015: 20, 44 and 71–73) for more details.

other's idiosyncrasies, that author might have penned the sections containing the reference to the water of Kedāra, the praise of *vidyā*, and the tantric connotations thereof in both texts—to the effect that they originally harmonized.<sup>204</sup>

As we have already observed,<sup>205</sup> *Guhyasūtra* 1.4 refers to the *Niśvāsamukha* in the very beginning of the work; likewise, the very end of the *Guhyasūtra* (18.15) displays a cross-reference of similarly doubtful authenticity.<sup>206</sup>

If the above mentioned cross-references to the *Niśvāsamukha* (in *Guhyasūtra* 1.4 and 18.15) are not subsequent insertions, but instead were original components of the work, then the *Niśvāsamukha* must chronologically precede the *Guhyasūtra*. Yet, given their positions at the very beginning and the very end of the text, the likelihood is that both of them were added subsequently during a late stage of the composition of the *Guhyasūtra*. We therefore hesitate to take these cross-references at face value, and choose to refrain from considering them in our calculations regarding the relative dating of these two texts.<sup>207</sup>

### The *Niśvāsamukha*'s Borrowings from the *Pāśupatasūtra*

The *Pāśupatasūtra* is one of the earliest sources from which the composer(s) of the *Niśvāsamukha* drew—it also appears to be the work on which the *Niśvāsamukha* draws most extensively. We recall that the *Pāśupatasūtra* is the earliest extant scripture traceable to the oldest known school of Śaivism, that of the Pāśupatas. In the *Niśvāsamukha*, the Pāśupata system is referred to as the Atimārga—‘the outer path.’<sup>208</sup> On the one hand, pivotal practices of the Pāśupata school are reserved for the brahmanical elite—ascetics have to be male brahmins for example.<sup>209</sup> On the other hand, the Pāśupata tenet system intentionally inverts traditional brahmani-

<sup>204</sup> The possibility that the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Guhyasūtra* were both fashioned after an unknown, external source, certainly remains.

<sup>205</sup> See p. 29.

<sup>206</sup> ‘Doubtful’ in the sense that both of these verses may be retroactive insertions by a scribe attempting to reinforce the internal cohesion of the compendium by crafting a link between the *Niśvāsamukha* and the four *sūtras*. Consult p. 30 for the full quotation of this extract.

<sup>207</sup> Hans BAKKER in a personal communication dated to 16<sup>th</sup> October 2015, attributes a greater degree of credibility to the cross-references than we are inclined to adopt: ‘Finally, the *Guhyasūtra* mentions the *Mukha* twice (1.4 & 18.13, 15), the *Mukha* never the *Guhyasūtra*. ... the odds are that the *Guhyasūtra* knew the *Mukha* and not the other way [a]round.’

<sup>208</sup> SANDERSON (1988: 664) renders Atimārga as the “outer path” because the latter system operates outside—both in implied, and overt, contradiction to—the brahmanical establishment; in particular, the Atimārga defies the teachings concerning the four stages of life (*caturāśrama*) central to the brahmanical system. Etymologically, however, Atimārga could also be translated as ‘transcendent path’.

<sup>209</sup> One of the bases for ascertained congruence between the Pāśupata school and the brahmanical tradition is the Pāśupata observance. SANDERSON mentions (1988: 664) that the latter is reserved for a brahmin who has already undergone the *upanayana* rite, in which the boy is invested with the sacred thread and hence qualified to learn the Veda.

cal observances in many instances<sup>210</sup>—this indicates the antinomian streak of the Pāśupatas. The fact that the *Niśvāsamukha*’s author(s) adopted extensive segments of the *Pāśupatasūtra* reveals that the Pāśupatas were still a prominent presence in contemporaneous society. It also shows, SANDERSON posits, that certain aspects of Mantramārga Śaivism comprise a continuation of core components of the tenet system of the Atimārga.<sup>211</sup>

The fourth section of the *Niśvāsamukha*, relating the ideas and practices of the Atimārga, commences at 4.70c and extends until 4.130d. It presents two distinct types of the Pāśupata system (4.123), namely the Atyāśrama (4.70c–88d) and the Lokātīta (4.89–130). The first, Atyāśrama, is offered in the guise of a fully versified paraphrase of the *Pāśupatasūtra*. In the following section, we shall investigate the precise way in which the *Niśvāsamukha* draws on the *Pāśupatasūtra*, for which task we will be presenting passages of correspondence between these two texts with an analytical emphasis on apparent alterations.<sup>212</sup>

Of course we cannot expect the *Pāśupatasūtra* to reappear verbatim in the textual fabric of the *Niśvāsamukha*: the fact that the *Niśvāsamukha* is in *anuṣṭubh* verse precludes any such possibility. What is more, textual fragments had to be rearranged in accordance with the stylistic and semantic dictates of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Still, despite the agenda with which the composers of the *Niśvāsamukha* approach the content of the *Pāśupatasūtra*—namely to compile a compendium which re-contextualizes earlier related systems as ancillary and subservient to tantric Śaivism—one can nevertheless speak of an affinity in perspective.<sup>213</sup> Let us proceed to investigate the extant evidence.

In some cases, the fact that a fragment comprises borrowed text that has been altered and expanded upon is clear and conspicuous. For example, *Pāśupatasūtra* 1.18 *akaluṣamateḥ* ‘of one [who is] of unclouded mind’ is rendered in *Niśvāsamukha* 4.75ab as *akāluṣyena bhāvena jantum paśyeta sarvataḥ*: ‘one should see all living beings with an unclouded disposition.’ We suppose that this text grew not just as a corollary of the dictates of metre, but mostly out of the need to make explicit and

<sup>210</sup> This becomes evident when ruminating upon the following injunctions: *bhasmani śayīta* ‘one should sleep in ashes,’ ... *unmattavad eko vicareta loke* ‘one should stroll around in the world alone like a mad person,’ *śmaśānavāsi* ... ‘one should live in a cremation ground’ (*Pāśupatasūtra* 1.3, 4.4 and 5.20).

<sup>211</sup> The reader is here referred to SANDERSON (2006: 199 ff.).

<sup>212</sup> Other than for the most significant findings, which are presented below, the reader is encouraged to consult the translation and accompanying notes of the section in question (*Niśvāsamukha* 4.70c–88d). We have followed the system of numbering of the *Pāśupatasūtra* which is based on Kauṇḍinya’s commentary (i.e. in accordance with ŚĀSTRĪ’s edition); this does not accord with the *sūtrapāṭha* of BISSCHOP (2007).

<sup>213</sup> We hold that the embedding of the content of the *Niśvāsa*-corpus in a stratified scheme of five streams indicates that the author was driven, at least in part, by an ‘inclusivistic’ approach that sought to elevate the Mantramārga above its appropriated counterparts. For a brief reacquaintance with the five streams, refer to pp. 18ff).

clarify the meaning of a source text that by dint of its genre-specific parameters—those of the *sūtras*—tends to be notoriously terse.

First of all, let us turn to cases where the text of the *Niśvāsamukha* deviates significantly from the *Pāśupatasūtra*, although the intended meaning remains largely identical:

## PĀŚUPATASŪTRA

## NĪŚVĀSAMUKHA

- *carataḥ* 1.19

*evaṃ yo varttate nityaṃ* 4.86a

Of somebody who wanders [thus]

[If] somebody always remains thus

- *kāma-rūpitvam* 1.24

*yathepsitam* 4.87b

capability of shapeshifting

whatever he desires

- *avamataḥ |  
sarvabhūteṣu* 3.3–4

*viparītāni karmamāṇi  
kurvaṃl lokajugupsitaḥ |* 4.78cd

being insulted amidst all beings

performing transgressive acts  
censured by people

- *paribhūyamāno hi vidvān  
kṛtsnatapā bhavati* 3.19

*paribhūtaḥ kṛcchratapā  
sarvalokeṣu ninditaḥ |  
mahātapāś ca bhavate* 4.81c–82a

For, a wise person being humiliated becomes someone who has undergone all penances

humiliated, practising severe *tapas*, and blamed everywhere, he becomes great in *tapas*

- *sarvaviśiṣṭo 'yaṃ panthāḥ |  
satpathaḥ* 4.16–17

*sanmārggavratacārīṇe* 4.84d

The path is distinguished above all others, [it is the] good path  
(HARA 1966: 367)

For the one who practises the observances of the right path

Although the intended meanings for each of the above-listed pairs of expressions are largely identical, the redactor still introduces noteworthy changes in formulation. In our view, these stylistic changes were made with the aim of streamlining the tone of the appropriated section in order to harmonize it with the wider textual body of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

That being said, we also encounter semantic discrepancies between Pāśupata injunctions and their reformulations in the *Niśvāsamukha*. In the following example we find a reference to the *liṅga*, the icon of Śiva, in the textual fabric of the *Niśvāsamukha* which is absent both in the *Pāśupatasūtra* and in Kaunḍinya's commentary—evidently, the inclusion of the *liṅga* in the *Niśvāsamukha* constitutes an act of innovation. If unintentional innovation is a possibility to be considered, then it is conceivable that the paraphrased text may have appeared as the result of relatively loose paraphrasing. Perhaps, due to quasi-synonymous use of the terms *āyatana* ('temple' or 'abode') and *liṅgasyāyatana* ('temple [housing a] *liṅga*') in common parlance, the redactor saw no difference between *āyatana* and *liṅgasyāyatana* ('the abode of the *liṅga*'). In opting for the rendition of *liṅgasyāyatana* in the *Niśvāsamukha* the author might have sought to render explicit what he considered to be an implicit shade of meaning in the *Pāśupatasūtra*.<sup>214</sup> Therefore he may not have been aware of having introduced a potentially significant modification:

PĀŚUPATASŪTRA 1.7

NIŚVĀSAMUKHA 4.72a

*āyatanavāsi**liṅgasyāyatane vāsaḥ*

resident of a temple

he [should take up his] abode in  
the house of a *liṅga* [i.e. a temple]

Another conspicuous modification concerns mantra recitation. At 1.17, the *Pāśupatasūtra* and Kaunḍinya's commentary thereto, attest to two valid alternatives of performing recitation: one can opt either to recite the *raudrī gāyatrī* or the *bahurūpī gāyatrī*. Conversely, *Niśvāsamukha* 4.74d enjoins the recitation of the *bahurūpī gāyatrī* mantra without giving any sanctioned alternative. We cannot as of yet determine whether or not the *Niśvāsamukha* is responsible for abolishing the option of reciting the *raudrī gāyatrī*, as there is a possibility that the *Niśvāsamukha* simply borrowed the passages from a third source.

PĀŚUPATASŪTRA 1.17

NIŚVĀSAMUKHA 4.74d

*raudrīm gāyatrīm bahurūpīm vā  
japet**bahurūpan tato japet*he should recite the *gāyatrī* of  
appeal to Rudra or the *aghora*  
[mantra]then he should recite the *aghora*  
[mantra]

In the following passage, the *Niśvāsamukha* surprisingly replaces *hasita*, 'laughter,' with *stava*, 'eulogy,'—this idea is not traceable in the *Pāśupatasūtra*. If the

<sup>214</sup> Kaunḍinya states, in his commentary on *Pāśupatasūtra* 1.7, that since people worship at that place, it is called an *āyatana* (*yajanāc cāyatanam*); but he makes no mention of a *liṅga*.

modification was executed intentionally, this might suggest that by the time of composition of the *Niśvāsamukha*, the offering (*upahāra*) of laughter to Śiva was far less widespread. Instead, a new, less radical, custom of worship may have begun to emerge in its stead. Furthermore, as we shall see at present, the ordering of the individual elements in the verse of the *Niśvāsamukha* differs from the sequencing in the *Pāśupatasūtra*, and the word *upahāra* is missing in the *Niśvāsamukha*. This, however, may simply be attributable to the constraints of metre:

## PĀŚUPATASŪTRA 1.8

*hasitagītanṛtya-  
huḍḍunikāranamaskāra-  
japyopahāreṇopatiṣṭhet*

he should honour with laugh-  
ter, songs, dance, the sounds of  
HUḌḌUṆ, homage by the word  
*namas*, mantra recitation, and  
gifts

## NĪŚVĀSAMUKHA 4.72b–72d

*huḍḍunikārastavaḥ tathā |  
gītanṛtyanamaskārair  
brahmabhir japasamyutaḥ |*

he [should praise] with the sound  
HUḌḌUṆ, sing, dance, [pay]  
homage with the word *namas*  
and recite the [five] *brahma*  
[mantras]

Nowhere in the *Pāśupatasūtra* do we encounter any reference to the concept of *pūjā*, ‘worship’, yet the *Niśvāsamukha*, for its part, mentions it in several instances. This constitutes a substantial change of perspective, since the Pāśupatas were considered to be practising a form of religion that transcends the established traditions, especially in the domain of structured ritual. But we could assume that the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* treated the terms *yajana* and *pūjā* interchangeably. Thus, we cannot exclude the possibility that this change too, was the unpremeditated result of loose paraphrasing:

## PĀŚUPATASŪTRA 2.9–11

*tasmād ubhayathā yaṣṭavyaḥ;  
devavat pitṛvac ca;  
ubhayaṃ tu rudre devāḥ pitaraś ca*

thus, he should be venerated in  
both ways; like the gods and the  
ancestors; as both the gods and the  
ancestors are certainly [present] in  
Rudra

## NĪŚVĀSAMUKHA 4.76ab

*pitṛpūjāṃ devapūjāṃ  
ubhe devāya kalpayet |*

worship as performed for ances-  
tors and worship as performed  
for gods: one should perform  
[them] both for the great god (i.e.  
Rudra)

This is not, however, the only instance of the word *pūjā* in the Pāśupata section of the *Niśvāsamukha*, for it occurs again in 4.71b–71d,<sup>215</sup> which has no parallel in the

<sup>215</sup> ... *guhyaṣṭhānaṃ parivrajat | darśanārthan tu īśasya pūjān tatraiva kalpayet |*.

*Pāśupatasūtra*. *Niśvāsamukha* 4.81d (*pūjālābhavivarjitaḥ*) once more includes *pūjā* among the injunctions of the *Pāśupatas*. The offering of withered flowers, which is described in the *Niśvāsamukha* (4.73cd) and also forms part of *pūjā* ritual, implies a *Pāśupata* concept even though it is not attested in the *Pāśupatasūtra* itself.<sup>216</sup> There is a possibility that the version of the *Pāśupatasūtra* available to the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* was different from that which is available to us through Kaunḍinya's commentary. Further, we find non-standard *aiśa* grammar strewn<sup>217</sup> among the verses of the *Niśvāsamukha*, while the corresponding passages of the *Pāśupatasūtra* follow standard grammar. In the first instance, when two *Pāśupatasūtras* featuring the neuter *s*-stem *vāsa*s are paraphrased in the *Niśvāsamukha*, the word is treated as a masculine *a*-stem, *vāsa*. In the second instance, the standard optative singular *avekṣet* of the *Pāśupatasūtra* has been replaced with its common equivalent, but irregularly in the *ātmanepada*, resulting in the form *paśyeta*:

## PĀŚUPATASŪTRA

## NĪŚVĀSAMUKHA

- *ekavāsāḥ | avāsā vā* 1.10–11

*ekavāso hy avāso vā* 4.73a

he [should wear] one garment or  
[be] without garment

he should wear one garment or  
[be] naked

- *mūtrapurīṣaṃ nāvekṣet* 1.12

*mūtrāmedhyan na paśyeta* 4.74a

he should not look at urine and ex-  
crement

he should not look at urine and  
excrement

There are some sections in the *Niśvāsamukha* that, as SANDERSON has explained,<sup>218</sup> could possibly constitute innovative additions to paraphrased material borrowed from external sources. Amongst the sources that we now know of, there are four independent *Pāśupata* ritual texts ascribed to a certain Gārgya. These are the *Samskāraavidhi*,<sup>219</sup> *Antyeṣṭividhi*,<sup>220</sup> *Pātravidhi*,<sup>221</sup> and the *Prāyaścittavidhi*, all of which have come to light due to the efforts of D. ACHARYA, who has published three of the works (with the fourth announced as forthcoming in the foreseeable future). In these sources also, we did not find what appear to be addenda. Our search in the fifth principal source consulted for this task, the *Pampāmāhātmya*,<sup>222</sup> a text which contains components of the *Pāśupatasūtras* in a paraphrased form, also did not yield any results.

<sup>216</sup> This will be further investigated on p. 72.

<sup>217</sup> On the significance of *aiśa* grammar, see p. 113.

<sup>218</sup> Cf. SANDERSON (2006: 158).

<sup>219</sup> D. ACHARYA (2007).

<sup>220</sup> D. ACHARYA (2010).

<sup>221</sup> D. ACHARYA (2011).

<sup>222</sup> FILLIOZAT (2001: 91–152).

Why were the paraphrased borrowings interpolated with addenda during the process of integration into the *Niśvāsamukha*? First of all, we should bear in mind that we are analyzing a fully versified text. It is undoubtedly, at least partially, the case, that in the process of drafting verses, transit-words and other items of textual inflation (verse-fillers) found their way into the textual fabric of the *Niśvāsamukha*. For example, a phrase like *jīṭendriya*, ‘with the senses subjugated’ appears both in the *Niśvāsamukha* 4.70d as (*bhasmaśāyī jīṭendriyaḥ*) and in 4.83a (*jīṭendriyaś ca dāntaś ca*). While one of these mentions in the *Niśvāsamukha* is certainly a parallel for *Pāśupatasūtra* 5.11,<sup>223</sup> the other is a repetition, most likely serving as mere verse-filler, reiterated so as to not distort the fundamental meaning of the passage, but certainly without adding any semantic content.<sup>224</sup>

There are, however, some other sections in the text which might constitute unaltered, or at least minimally distorted, Pāśupata injunctions. For example, *Niśvāsamukha* 4.73cd *suśīrṇapatitaiḥ puṣpair ddevadevaṃ samarccayet* ‘he should worship the god of gods with withered, fallen flowers.’ This passage is reminiscent of the important Pāśupata concept of *ahiṃsā*, ‘non-harm.’ Since the Pāśupata are conscious of the subtle implications of *hiṃsā*, ‘harmfulness,’ they may have regarded the culling of living flowers as an act to be avoided.<sup>225</sup> In this regard, Kaunḍinya’s commentary on the *Pāśupatasūtra* leads its readers to conclude that *ahiṃsā* is a core-concept of the Pāśupata tenet system, to be rigorously applied in ritual practices. Kaunḍinya explains that the concept of *ahiṃsā* is fundamental to the practice of a Pāśupata ascetic. In order to avoid harming creatures he is enjoined to eat the food prepared by others (*parakṛta*), live in a temple prepared by others, wear *nirmālya*, ‘the discarded garlands of god’ and bathe in *bhasma*, ‘ashes’, instead of water, so as to avoid direct harm to living creatures.<sup>226</sup> This effectively means that in theory he deliberately avoids, at least according to Kaunḍinya, every possibility of harm inflicted upon any creature. Since the *ahiṃsā* concept is thus an ubiquitous and foundational principle of the Pāśupata school, we assume that *suśīrṇapatitaiḥ puṣpair ddevadevaṃ samarccayet* is not just a verse-filler, but quite likely an authentic Pāśupata injunction, although we have not yet been able to trace it in Pāśupata sources. Moreover, it is probable that a wealth of Pāśupata materials have been lost, so our not finding it may not be conclusive evidence that it did not come from a lost Pāśupata source.

The passage of the *Niśvāsamukha* (4.83d) *naikānnādaḥ kadācana*, ‘he [should] never eat food [that is obtained] from a singular [household]’ might also not have a direct parallel in the limited, extant literature available to us; however, it does not

<sup>223</sup> *Pāśupatasūtra* 5.11 includes *jīṭendriyaḥ* (‘somebody who has conquered his sense-faculties’) only once.

<sup>224</sup> A similar example may be the phrase *prāṇāyāma* ‘breath control’ that occurs in 4.85a. As this term has already been used in 4.74ab and is paralleled by *Pāśupatasūtra* 1.16, the second occurrence in 4.85a must have served as reiterative verse-filler.

<sup>225</sup> The reader is here referred to SANDERSON 2014: 10, fn. 38.

<sup>226</sup> See HARA 2002: 71–73.



appear to be an addendum resulting from the dictates of metre—and indeed the *Prāyaścittavidhi* (v. 81), one of the recently rediscovered Pāsupata texts, prescribes atonement for eating food collected from a single household in certain conditions.

Likewise, the following verse of *Niśvāsamukha* 4.77 is without traceable textual parallel in the *Pāsupatasūtra*:

*śītātapaparikleśair jalam aśrū --- sibhiḥ |*  
*japadhyānaparo nityaṃ sarvadvandvasahiṣṇutā || 4.77 ||*

Through the hardships of cold and heat; water [...] He should always be dedicated to mantra recitation and meditation, and should [have] the capacity for patient endurance of all kinds of pairs [of opposites].

Although we have not found any parallel for this in the *Pāsupatasūtra*, the elements of the verse may have been original components of the borrowed content. We know that enduring the hardships of cold and heat is a widespread practice of asceticism (cf. for example *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 3.52) and therefore does not present any semantic ‘criterion of incoherence’,<sup>227</sup> for which reason the meaning conveyed, also, does not imply later redactory influence. Finally, as regards the specific mode of expression of this injunction, we find the compound *°dvandvasahiṣṇutā/dvandvasahiṣṇutva* attested to in Pāsupata sources, such as the *Pāñcārthabhāṣya* (= *Pāsupatasūtrabhāṣya*, p. 121). For these reasons, we believe that the above verse, taken from the *Niśvāsamukha*, may reflect an authentic injunction of the original Pāsupata tradition.<sup>228</sup>

Most striking is that the Pāsupata section of the *Niśvāsamukha* does not display the five Brahmamantras in the order we expect to encounter them in. Since these

<sup>227</sup> ‘Criteria of incoherence’ is a term OBERLIES (1997: 76) explained to be indicators for textual accretion: “*Inkohärenzkriterien ... sind Indizien für ein Wachstum des Textes.*”

<sup>228</sup> As regards the remaining noteworthy innovations we have detected in the Pāsupata-section of the *Niśvāsamukha*, they are listed below. We assume that these addenda, though likely subjected to stylistic (and possibly semantic) inflation, may reflect authentic Pāsupata injunctions, some of which could have entered the tradition after the time of composition of the *Pāsupatasūtra*.

- 4.78a *japaniṣṭhaikāntaratīḥ* ‘being intent upon mantra recitation and enjoying solitude.’
- 4.80a *vikrośen* ‘he should tremble.’
- 4.80cd *viruddhaceṣṭitaṃ vākyaṃ viruddhañ cāñjanaṃ sadā* ‘[he should engage in] inappropriate behaviour, inappropriate speech, [and] always [apply] inappropriate ointments.’
- 4.81ab *viruddhamanḍanaṃ gātre sarvadā samupakramet* ‘he should always apply inappropriate ornaments on his body.’
- 4.83ab ... *dāntaś ca kṣamā kāmavivarjitaḥ* ‘[he should] be restrained, be forgiving, [and] free from desire.’
- 4.86b *dambhalobhavivarjitaḥ* ‘devoid of pride and greed.’

mantras feature prominently in the *Pāśupatasūtra*, with each one inserted at the end of each of the five chapters, it is worth inspecting the cause of their absence in the *Niśvāsamukha*. Were these mantras not a part of the *Pāśupatasūtra* which the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* drew upon? If this is the case, was perhaps Kauṇḍinya responsible for the division of the *Pāśupatasūtra* into five chapters, adding one of these mantras to each chapter as a quasi-marker? Finally, were these mantras an original element of the *Pāśupatasūtra* and the person who paraphrased it deliberately left them out? At this point, we are only able to raise these issues and guess at explanations.

Not only are the Brahmamantras not included in the account of the *Niśvāsamukha*, but the salvific rewards of following the injunctions are also not contained in the rendition of the *Niśvāsamukha*, although they directly precede the presentation of Brahmamantras in the account of the *Pāśupatasūtra*.

### The *Niśvāsamukha*'s Borrowings from the *Manusmṛti*

As we have mentioned in passing, another work upon which the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* evidently drew was the *Manusmṛti*—one of the most influential works of the brahmanical tradition.<sup>229</sup> This work has substantially influenced the profile of the *Niśvāsamukha*—in particular the injunctions regarding donative practices (2.37 ff.), practising observances (3.37 ff.), worshipping ancestors (2.39–41), using the five products of the cow, the ritual handling of *kuśa*-grass<sup>230</sup> and the like. The majority of these individual instances of borrowing occur in the Laukika section of the *Niśvāsamukha*, which are hence strongly influenced by the brahmanical tradition. Let us consider the possibility that the *Niśvāsamukha* borrowed directly from the *Manusmṛti* rather than via a third source that was itself influenced by the latter. This remains rather difficult to assess. On the one hand, the *Niśvāsamukha* being a comparatively early work, it would not have been able to draw on a great number of *Purāṇas*, simply because these had not yet been composed in great number. On the other hand, any assimilated text would be expected to lose its original texture upon being transplanted into a novel linguistic or structural environment. Since the *Niśvāsamukha* has generally made modifications to any textual borrowings that were originally in standard Pāṇinian grammar, it becomes even more difficult to assess whether the source of borrowing had been the *Manusmṛti* itself or a later related source. In the *Niśvāsamukha*'s section listing Laukika religious observances, we encounter the following verse concerning the *atikṛcchra* (3.40) observance:

*ekaikaṃ bhakṣayed grāsaṃ trīṇy ahāni jīvendriyaḥ |*  
*trirātropavasec caiva atikṛcchraṃ viśodhane ||*

<sup>229</sup> For the *Manusmṛti* and its place in the brahmanical tradition, see OLIVELLE's introduction to the *Manusmṛti* (2005).

<sup>230</sup> See, for example, 3.37 in the *Niśvāsamukha*.

Having subdued one's sense faculties, one should, for three days, eat [only] a mouthful and one should fast for three nights. [This kind of religious observance is called] *atikṛcchra*, o pure lady!

If we compare this to the definition in the *Manusmṛti* (11.214) we find changes of content and style:

*ekaikaṃ grāsam aśnīyāt tryahāṇi trīṇi pūrvavat |*  
*tryahaṃ copavased antyam atikṛcchraṃ caran dvijaḥ ||*

A twice-born, observing the *atikṛcchra*, should, eat [only] a mouthful at each of the three times for three days, as before for three-days and during the last three days.

Apart from minimal changes of vocabulary, such as replacing *aśnīyāt* with *bhakṣayed*, and alterations in word-order, the *Niśvāsamukha* replaces *pūrvavat* with *jīteन्द्रियाḥ* and *caran dvijaḥ* with *viśodhane*. In the *Manusmṛti* these two words—*pūrvavat* and *caran dvijaḥ*—fit the particular context. The word *pūrvavat* refers to nine-day periods, as taught in verse 11.212 of the *Manusmṛti*, where a twice-born man, practising the *prājāpatya*-penance, is supposed to eat in the morning for three days; in the evening for three days; the following three days he should eat unsolicited food. As the preceding section of the *Niśvāsamukha* concerns the *sāntapana*-penance, the procedure of practising this observance is different to that of the *prājāpatya*. The text hence replaces this word, according to the demands of the context, by *jīteन्द्रियाḥ*, a term which appears to perform the function of a verse-filler. Similarly *caran dvijaḥ* makes perfect sense in the context of the *Manusmṛti*, as this type of penance is listed among others which are meant to be practised by twice-born people. Such a restriction is not fitting to the context of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

Moreover, the *Niśvāsamukha*'s grammar is less standard and as such accords with the style of the language of the *Niśvāsa*. As will be shown in a separate section,<sup>231</sup> the overall language of the *Niśvāsamukha* is a mixture of Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian *aiśa* forms. The *Niśvāsamukha* replaces *tryahaṃ copavased* with a less standard compound *trirātropavaset*, where the ending of the expected accusative *trirātram* has been irregularly elided with the following word.

In the same section of the *Niśvāsamukha*, we find a verse which relates the *sāntapana*-observance. If we compare the version of the *Niśvāsamukha* with that of the *Manusmṛti*, apart from negligible other changes, the *Niśvāsamukha* also introduces a half a line to herald the result of carrying out the *sāntapana* observance. Since the *Manusmṛti*-segment is transplanted into a textual environment that is embedded in a schematic structure whereby rewards for the various observances are systematically, the compiler must have felt inclined to supply such information, despite the fact the original segment of the *Manusmṛti* does not specify any rewards. The version of the *Manusmṛti* (11.213) reads as follows:

<sup>231</sup> See p. 113 ff.

*gomūtram gomayaṃ kṣīraṃ dadhi sarpiḥ kuśodakam |*  
*ekarātropavāsaś ca kṛcchraṃ sāntapanam smṛtam ||*

Subsisting on cow's urine, cow dung, milk, curd, ghee, and water boiled with Kuśa grass, and fasting during one day—tradition calls this *Sāntapana* penance.<sup>232</sup>

The *Niśvāsamukha*'s text (3.37a–38b), however, appears as follows:

*māse māse tu yaḥ kuryād ekarātram upoṣitaḥ |*  
*pañcagavyaṃ śucir bhūtvā pītvā sāntapanam bhavet ||*  
*samvatsareṇa śuddhātmā brahmaloke mahīyate |*

If someone observes (*kuryāt*) fasting for one night every month (*māse māse*) after consuming [only] the five products of the cow having first purified himself—[this] would be *Sāntapana*. [By observing this vow of *Sāntapana*] for a year, one [becomes] pure and will be honoured in the world of Brahmā.

Similarly, the *Manusmṛti* (11.217), defining the *cāndrāyaṇa* observance, says:

*ekaikaṃ hrāsayet piṇḍaṃ kṛṣṇe śukle ca vardhayet |*  
*upasprśaṃs triṣavaṇam etat cāndrāyaṇam smṛtam ||*

He should decrease his food by one rice-ball a day during the dark fortnight and increase it likewise during the bright fortnight, bathing three times a day—tradition calls this *cāndrāyaṇa* (the lunar penance).<sup>233</sup>

This appears in *Niśvāsamukha* 3.43–44 thus:

*ekaikaṃ varddhayed grāsaṃ śukle kṛṣṇe ca hrāsayet |*  
*triṣkālasnāyī māsan tu candravṛddhyā vratañ caret ||*  
*cāndrāyaṇam idaṃ śreṣṭhaṃ sarvapāpāpanodanam |*  
*pāpī mucyeta pāpena apāpaḥ svarggago bhavet ||*

One should increase [one's food] by a mouthful [a day in the days of] the bright fortnight and should decrease it [during the days] of the dark fortnight [by a mouthful a day] and should bathe three times a day; [one should] observe this observance for a month in accordance with the changing of the moon (*candravṛddhyā*). This is the excellent lunar observance (*cāndrāyaṇa*), which removes all sins. A sinner will be freed from sin [by performing it], and one who has not committed sin will go to heaven.

<sup>232</sup> OLIVELLE 2005: 226.

<sup>233</sup> OLIVELLE 2005: 226–227.

The *Niśvāsamukha* here refers to two types of people practicing this observance: on the one hand, there is the *pāpī*, ‘sinful one’, on the other, it mentions the *apāpah*, ‘one without sin’. The text emphasizes this distinction throughout the section on *upavāsa*, ‘fasting.’ Accordingly, it describes two types of rewards, one for the sinful person and the other for the practitioner ‘without sin’. Such a distinction of agent and reward is absent in the *Manusmṛti*, for which reason one could argue for the account in the *Niśvāsamukha* being conceptually somewhat more sophisticated in this regard. The two adjectives, *śreṣṭhaṃ* and *sarvapāpāpanodanam*, are

not present in the original text of the *Manusmṛti*. Once again, the fruit of observing this *cāndrāyaṇa* is an additional element, only mentioned in the *Niśvāsamukha*.<sup>234</sup>

<sup>234</sup> There are comparable, relevant examples that are here reproduced for illustrative purposes:

## MANUSMṚTI

*caturah prātar aśnīyāt  
piṇḍān viprah samāhitah |  
caturo 'stamite sūrye  
śīśucāndrāyaṇaṃ smṛtam || 11.220*

A Brāhmin should eat four rice-balls in the morning with a collected mind and four after sunset—tradition calls this the lunar penance of children. (OLIVELLE 2005: 227)

*aṣṭāv aṣṭau samaśnīyāt  
piṇḍān madhyamdine sthite |  
niyatātmā haviṣyasya  
yaticāndrāyaṇaṃ caran || 11.219*

A man practicing the lunar penance of ascetics should eat each day at noon eight rice-balls from the sacrificial oblation, controlling his self. (OLIVELLE 2005: 227)

## NIŚVĀSAMUKHA

*caturo bhakṣayet piṇḍān  
pūrvāhne tu vicakṣaṇah ||  
sūryasyāstamane vāpi  
caturo bhakṣayet punah |  
śīśucāndrāyaṇaṃ hy etad  
upapātakanāśanam ||  
māsenaikena śuddhātmā  
apāpī svargatiṃ vrajet | 3.46c–3.48b*

A wise man should eat four lumps of rice in the forenoon, and again he should [eat] four lumps of rice after the setting of the sun; this observance which [is called] *śīśucāndrāyaṇa* destroys [the demerit accrued from] minor transgressions. By observing it for a month (*māsenaikena*) one becomes pure-souled; if someone who is [already] free of sin performs it for three nights, he will go to heaven.

*aṣṭāv aṣṭau samaśnīyāt  
piṇḍān madhyandine sthite |  
haviṣyeṇa samāyuktān  
mucyate sarvapātakaiḥ ||  
apāpī svarggam āyāti  
yaticāndrāyaṇena tu | 3.45a–46b*

One should eat eight rice-lumps each noon from the sacrificial oblation (*haviṣyeṇa samāyuktān*). By [this religious observance which is called] *yaticāndrāyaṇa* one will be freed from all crimes (*sarvapātakaiḥ*); [but] if he is sinless, he will go to heaven.

In the first example, the *Niśvāsamukha* states that the *Śīśucāndrāyaṇa* observance (‘lunar observance of children’) removes secondary sins, allowing people to purify themselves within a month. Having attained a state of purity, they will go to heaven. This has no equivalent in the *Manusmṛti*. In the second example, too, the *Niśvāsamukha* asserts that by practising the *Yaticāndrāyaṇa* observance, one becomes free from all sins and, being sinless, goes to heaven. This again stands in contrast with the *Manusmṛti*.

Let us next examine a parallel concerning the rules for householders in the *Niśvāsamukha*'s Vaidika section, where a change of choice of vocabulary may have entailed a total rearrangement of word-order. The original reading *upaskaraḥ* of the *Manusmṛti* is replaced by the synonymous term *pramārjanī* in the *Niśvāsamukha*. Moreover, *badhyate yās tu vāhayan* is replaced by *kathitās tava śobhane* to fit the context of the *Niśvāsamukha*. The result is, at least superficially, an entirely new verse in the *Niśvāsamukha*:

## MANUSMṚTI

*pañca sūnā gṛhasthasya  
cullī peṣaṇy upaskaraḥ |  
kaṇḍanī codakumbhaś ca  
badhyate yās tu vāhayan ||* 3.68

A householder has five slaughter-houses: fireplace, grindstone, broom, mortar and pestle, and water pot. By his use of them, he is fettered. (OLIVELLE 2005: 112)

## NIŚVĀSAMUKHA

*peṣaṇī kaṇḍanī cullī  
udakumbhaḥ pramārjanī |  
pañca sūnā bhavanty ete  
kathitās tava śobhane ||* 4.19

Mortar and pestle, fireplace, water-pot and broom are the five slaughter-houses of [a householder]; these have been taught to you, o beautiful one!

There are some instances of the *Niśvāsamukha* employing *aiśa* language<sup>235</sup> while lightly modifying the original formulation of the *Manusmṛti*—be it intentionally or inadvertently.<sup>236</sup> The *Niśvāsamukha* recurrently uses grammatical forms that from the standpoint of standard Pāṇinian grammar are incorrect. Consider, for instance, how the *Manusmṛti* (3.197) presents the list of the ancestors of the four *varṇas* in standard Pāṇinian grammar:

*somapā nāma viprāṇām kṣatriyāṇām havirbhujah |  
vaiśyānām ājyapā nāma śūdrāṇām tu sukālinaḥ ||*

The ancestors of Brāhmins are called Somapas; of Kṣatriyas, Havirbhujas; of Vaiśyas, Ājyapas; and of Śūdras, Sukālins. (OLIVELLE 2005: 118)

This is how the same verse appears in the version of the *Niśvāsamukha* (3.155):

<sup>235</sup> For a more detailed account on *aiśa* use, refer to p. 113 ff.

<sup>236</sup> Tim LUBIN, in a personal communication, dated 31<sup>st</sup> of March, 2018, reminded us that although “it is possible that the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* deliberately changed the *Manusmṛti* to conform to *aiśa* ‘norms’, it is not the only way to explain textual discrepancies.” As a matter of fact, he argues that “the very fact that past scholars take note of this irregularity would be due to their own familiarity with Pāṇinian rules. In all likelihood, it is thus a form of apologetics.” Note that a further possible alternative Tim LUBIN presents as explanation for this irregularity is “that the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* was citing stanzas from memory—stanzas that may have been circulating under Manu’s name, but not necessarily in the form of the text handed out to us in printed editions.”

*pitaras somapā vipre kṣatriye tu havirbhujāḥ |*  
*ājyapā vaiśyayonau tu śūdrāṇān tu sukālinaḥ ||*

In the case of a Brāhmin, the ancestors will be [called] Somapās; in the case of a Kṣatriya, Havirbhujas; in the case of a Vaiśya, Ājyapas; and for Śūdras, [they are called] Sukālins.

The author of the *Niśvāsamukha* does not make changes of vocabulary here, but the genitives, namely, *viprāṇām*, *kṣatriyāṇām* and *vaiśyāṇām* of the *Manusmṛti* have been replaced by locatives *vipre*, *kṣatriye* and *vaiśyayonau* in the *Niśvāsamukha*. At the end of the verse, however, the *Niśvāsamukha* retains the original genitive form (*śūdrāṇān*), rendering the construction unbalanced and surprising. This usage could be considered to be one of the features of *aiśa* language—although syntactically either genitive or locative is permissible, the combination in what are otherwise parallel phrases is disturbing. Other *aiśa* transformations include the following:

#### MANUSMṚTI

*ṣaṭtriṃśadābdikaṃ caryaṃ*  
*gurau traivedikaṃ vratam |*  
*tadardhikaṃ pādikam vā*  
*grahaṇāntikam eva vā || 3.1*

He should carry out the observance relating to the three Vedas at his teacher's house, an observance lasting thirty-six years, or one-half or one-quarter of that time, or else until he has learnt them. (OLIVELLE 2005: 108)

*adhyāpanaṃ brahmayajñāḥ*  
*pitṛyajñas tu tarpaṇam |*  
*homo daivo balir bhauto*  
*nṛyajño 'tithipūjanam ||*  
*pañcāitān yo mahāyajñān*  
*na hāpayati śaktitaḥ |*  
*sa gr̥he 'pi vasan nityaṃ*  
*sūnādoṣair na lipyate || 3.70–71*

#### NIŚVĀSAMUKHA

*ṣaṭtriṃśadābdikā caryā*  
*guros traivedikaṃ vratam |*  
*tadardhikaṃ pādikam vā*  
*grahaṇāntikam eva vā || 4.5c–6b*

The [aforementioned] observance [should last] thirty-six years, and [this] commitment, based on the tripartite Veda, [should be carried out] at his teacher's [house]. Alternatively, [it may last] half of that [time] (i.e. eighteen years), or a quarter (i.e. nine years), or until he has learnt them [i.e. the Vedas]

*adhyāpanaṃ brahmayajñāṃ*  
*pitṛyajñān tu tarpṇaṇam |*  
*homo daivo balir bhauto*  
*nṛyajño 'tithipūjanam ||*  
*pañcāitāṃs tu mahāyajñāṃ*  
*na hāpayati śaktitaḥ |*  
*svagr̥he 'pi vasan nityaṃ*  
*sūnādoṣair na lipyate || 4.17–18*



The sacrifice to the Veda is teaching; the sacrifice to ancestors is the quenching libation; the sacrifice to gods is the burnt offering; the sacrifice to beings is the Bali offering; and the sacrifice to humans is the honoring of guests. If a man never fails to offer these five great sacrifices to the best of his ability, he remains unsullied by the taints of his slaughter-houses in spite of living permanently at home.  
(OLIVELLE 2005: 108)

The sacrifice to the Veda is teaching; the sacrifice to the ancestors is the quenching libation; the sacrifice to gods is the burnt offering; the sacrifice to beings is the Bali offering; and the sacrifice to humans is the honouring of guests. If a man never fails to offer these five great sacrifices to the best of his ability, he remains unsullied by the taints of his slaughter-houses in spite of living permanently at home.

In the first example, we observe that the *Niśvāsamukha* renders an irregular grammatical construction, an *aiśa* form, by employing the feminine *ṣaṭtrimśadabdikā caryā* in qualification of the neuter *traivedikaṃ vratam*. The *Manusmṛti*, in turn, displays the segment in accordance with the expected neuter case: *ṣaṭtrimśadābdikam* to qualify *caryam*. In the second example, the *Niśvāsamukha* furnishes an irregular neuter noun °*yajñam*, whereas the *Manusmṛti* records the regular masculine form, °*yajñah*.

In sum, the *Niśvāsamukha*'s borrowing from the *Manusmṛti* is significant for the history of early Śaivism, as it demonstrates that some features of orthodox brahmanical teaching were adopted by the Śaivas in the creation of their own corpus of teachings. This fact, yet again, buttresses SANDERSON's theory (2009) that, in essence, the religion of the Śaivas consists of a hybrid of Śaivism and Brahmanism.

### The *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Śivadharmasāstra*

The *Śivadharmasāstra* is the first in a group of non-tantric Śaiva works that is commonly called the *Śivadharmacorpus*.<sup>237</sup> A number of Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts transmit eight works of this corpus together. As regards the ordering principle,<sup>238</sup> the *Śivadharmasāstra*—being the oldest work of the group—generally features as the first text<sup>239</sup> in these manuscripts:<sup>240</sup>

#### 1. the *Śivadharmasāstra*

<sup>237</sup> For a summary of its chapters, see HAZRA 1952–53, and A. K. ACHARYA 2009: 28 ff.

<sup>238</sup> Note that DE SIMINI (2016b) has recorded individual instances of structural disparity between the individual multi-text manuscripts.

<sup>239</sup> The following listing reflects the most common order of presentation of the texts of the corpus. For an overview of the manuscript transmission of the *Śivadharmacorpus*, see DE SIMINI 2016a.

<sup>240</sup> According to GOODALL (1998: 375), the first two texts have, in the course of time, been transmitted from North to South India.

2. the *Śivadharmottara*
3. the *Ṣaḍdarśanasanigraha*
4. the *Śivopaniṣad*
5. the *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*
6. the *Uttarottaramahāsaṃvāda*, also known as the *Umottara*
7. the *Vṛṣasārasanigraha*
8. the *Dharmaputrikā*<sup>241</sup>

Until recently, the *Śivopaniṣad* was the only work published from amongst this corpus, but there is now a printed version (albeit based on a single manuscript and full of errors) published by Yogi Narahari NĀTHA: all the previously listed texts are printed therein (omitted is the *Lalitavistara*, which is not transmitted in most manuscripts).<sup>242</sup> Recently, Florinda DE SIMINI has published a monograph that includes an edition and translation of the second chapter of the *Śivadharmottara* (2016a). More recently still, Peter BISSCHOP (2018) has published a monograph on the sixth chapter of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, the ‘Chapter on Appeasement’ (*Śāntiyadhyāya*), a work comprising a critical-edition-cum-translation with an annotated commentary of that section. There is now also an edition of the complete text of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, that of JUGNU & SHARMA (2014), which shows a general predilection towards the readings found in what BISSCHOP refers to as the ‘Pondicherry-Transcript’.<sup>243</sup> “The preface of the edition mentions, however, that it was based on a manuscript from Adyar” (Library),<sup>244</sup> while the ‘Pondicherry-Transcript’ was copied from a manuscript in Kilvelur. Finally, as we shall have occasion to mention below, there is A. K. ACHARYA’s 2009 edition of the first three chapters of the *Śivadharmasanigraha*.

<sup>241</sup> DE SIMINI & MIRNIG (2017) investigated an 11<sup>th</sup>-century Nepalese palmleaf manuscript in the Asiatic Society of Calcutta (G4077) which contains a longer text by the name of *Lalitavistara*. In the MS investigated by de DE SIMINI & MIRNIG (2017), this latter text—not to be confused with the Buddhist work by the same name—features in place of the *Dharmaputrikā* of our present listing. Note that there is a possibility that the *Lalitavistara* may also have been incorporated during the later stages of the textual history of the *Śivadharm*-corpus.

<sup>242</sup> See GOODALL 1998: 375–376, for a brief outline of this corpus; for a summary of each chapter of the texts of the *Śivadharm*-corpus including the *Lalitavistara*, see A. K. ACHARYA 2009: 22–82.

<sup>243</sup> BISSCHOP (2018) mentions the ‘Pondicherry-Transcript’ on p. 57 fn.107, being housed at the Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP), T 32, 156 folios, being a Devanāgarī paper transcript of a manuscript belonging to Kilvelur and bearing the title of *Śivadharmasāstra*. [http://muktalib7.org/IFP\\_ROOT/IFP/transcripts\\_data/T0032/PDF/T0032.pdf](http://muktalib7.org/IFP_ROOT/IFP/transcripts_data/T0032/PDF/T0032.pdf).

<sup>244</sup> JUGNU & SHARMA 2014: ix.

R.C. HAZRA, in two articles<sup>245</sup> published in the 1940s and 1950s in the journal *Puraṇa*, proposed approximate dates for the first two works of the corpus—the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*. He suggests that the former was composed between 200 and 500 CE, while the latter must have been composed much later, between 700 and 800 CE, on the grounds that it makes use of expressions such as *āgama* and *śivatāntra*, which HAZRA assumes to refer to tantric *Śaiva* scriptures.

This assumption, however, is far from certain. It is perhaps worth mentioning that the *Śivadharmottara* prescribes the installation of an image of Lakulīśa, a deity of no importance in the Mantramārga, yet indicative of a Pāśupata background. BISSCHOP (2014) has presented the view that some of the information in chapter six of the *Śivadharmasāstra* cannot predate the 6<sup>th</sup> century. More recently, upon examination of the sixth chapter of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, BISSCHOP (2018: 21) concludes that evidence<sup>246</sup>

suggest[s] that the text may have been composed towards the end of the 6<sup>th</sup> century at the earliest. In the light of Goodalls’s dating of the *Śivadharmottara* to the 7<sup>th</sup> century, the Atimārga milieu of the text, ... and the quotation in the *Kāraṇḍavyūhasūtra*, it will not have been much later than this. The *terminus ante quem* is the date of the incomplete *Śivadharmottara* manuscript, which was most probably written in the early 9<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>247</sup>

The *Niśvāsamukha* has sizeable parallels with the *Śivadharmasāstra*. The presence of parallels was to be expected, as we have seen above that the *Niśvāsamukha* is teaching lay Śaiva religious duties to common householders in its Laukika section—yet, one may ask, can we ascertain the direction of borrowing and situate these texts chronologically?

Let us first consider a telling example of a shared verse teaching the reward of recalling Śiva (*virūpākṣa*) which occurs verbatim as *Niśvāsamukha* 1.167c–168b and as *Śivadharmasāstra* 1.14c–15b:

*ekakālaṃ dvikālaṃ vā triṣkālaṃ vāpi nityaśaḥ ||*  
*ye smaranti virūpākṣaṃ vijñeyās te gaṇeśvarāḥ |*

<sup>245</sup> HAZRA (1940; 1952–3).

<sup>246</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the evidence consulted by Peter BISSCHOP which is indicative of the dating of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, refer to BISSCHOP 2018: 20–21. There BISSCHOP discusses the developmental stage of the concept of the Dikpālas as presented in the sixth chapter of the work, the four-faced form of Śiva (as contrasted with the later five-faced depiction of the deity), the inclusion of Ketu amongst the nine planets (Navagrahas), which “has only been attested to from 600 CE onwards”, etc.

<sup>247</sup> Note that Florinda DE SIMINI (2016a, ch. 2) presents a detailed treatment of the *Śivadharmacorpus* and offers her analysis regarding the date of the first two works. In further pursuit of this question, the reader is hence referred to her more detailed discussion on the date of these texts, in particular pp. 28–66 (or more briefly, pp. 63–63).

Those who always remember the oddly-eyed (*virūpākṣam*) once, twice or three times [a day], they are to be known as lords of Gaṇas.

Since both textual units are identical, it is likely that the borrowing between the two works occurred directly, rather than via a third source. Furthermore, there is no such Śaiva source known to us that predates the *Niśvāsamukha* and teaches lay Śaivism other than the *Śivadharmasāstra*. BISSCHOP has proposed a tentative dating for the sixth chapter of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, which, he believes, belongs to the late 6<sup>th</sup> century CE at the earliest.<sup>248</sup> If this credible hypothesis holds true, then the *Śivadharmasāstra* probably predates the *Niśvāsamukha*, which appears to originate from the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century. For this reason, we may posit that the latter borrowed from the former.

We may further note that both the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Śivadharmasāstra* share recommendations for constructing temporary *liṅgas* out of diverse substances.<sup>249</sup> One notable example is that of the making of a dust *liṅga* in *Śivadharmasāstra* 3.77c–78b, which is echoed in *Niśvāsamukha* 2.2. Although this example does not present an instance of verbatim repetition, the concept is presented in a comparable manner:

#### NIŚVĀSAMUKHA

*krīḍamānās tu ye bālā  
liṅgaṇi kurvanti pāṃśunā |  
labhanty ekāntato rājyaṃ  
nissapatnam akaṇṭakam ||*

Those children who make a *liṅga* at play will definitely obtain an unrivalled kingdom without enemies.

#### ŚIVADHARMAŚĀSTRA

*pāṃśunā krīḍamāno 'pi  
liṅgaṃ kuryāt tu yo naraḥ ||  
pratyante labhate rājyaṃ  
asapatnam akaṇṭakam |*

Any man at play, who erects a *liṅga* out of dust will obtain a universal kingdom without contest, without enemies.

Another distinctive recommendation is found in *Niśvāsamukha* 2.91cd: anyone who offers tooth-cleaning sticks, will receive a beautiful wife as reward. The causal connection between offering tooth-cleaning sticks and obtaining a beautiful wife in return features also in *Śivadharmasāstra* 12.72:

#### NIŚVĀSAMUKHA

*dantadhāvanadātā ca  
bhāryāṃ labhati śobhanām*

#### ŚIVADHARMAŚĀSTRA

*dantadhāvanam uddiṣṭaṃ  
nivedya śivayogine |  
divyastriḥbhogasamyuktaṃ  
divi ramyaṃ puraṃ labhet ||*

<sup>248</sup> See fn. 246.

<sup>249</sup> The reader is referred here to *Niśvāsamukha* 2.2 ff. and *Śivadharmasāstra* 3.63 ff.

And one who offers teeth-cleaning sticks (*dantadhāvanadātā*) will obtain a beautiful wife.

By offering promised teeth-cleaning sticks to a Śivayogin, one will obtain a beautiful city in heaven conjoined by the enjoyments of celestial ladies.

A further example illustrative of the close textual ties between the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Śivadharmasāstra* is the following account regarding a gradation of recipients (*pātra*) in accordance with their perceived merit. Note how *Niśvāsamukha* 2.117–119 is closely paralleled by *Śivadharmasāstra* 7.69–71:

## NĪŚVĀSAMUKHA

*mūrkhaviprasahasrebhyo  
vedādhyāyī paraḥ smṛtaḥ |  
vedādhyāyīśahasrebhyo  
hy āhitāgnis tato 'dhikaḥ ||  
āhitāgnisahasreṣu  
agnihotrī varaḥ smṛtaḥ |  
agnihotrīśahasreṣu  
brahmavettā tato 'dhikaḥ ||*

One learned in the Vedas is considered to outweigh thousands of foolish Brāhmins, one who has installed the Vedic fires is considered to be superior to thousands of men learned in the Vedas. Among the thousands of those who have installed the Vedic fires (*āhitāgni*) an *agnihotrī* (one who maintains the sacrificial fire) is considered to excel. Among the thousands of *agnihotrīs*, he who knows *brahman* (*brahmavettā*) is considered to be superior.

## ŚIVADHARMAŚĀSTRA

*brahmacārisahasrebhyo  
vedādhyāyī viśiṣyate |  
vedādhyāyīśahasrebhyo  
hy agnihotrī viśiṣyate ||  
agnihotrīśahasrebhyo  
yajñayājī viśiṣyate |  
yajñayājīśahasrebhyaḥ  
satrayājī viśiṣyate ||  
satrayājīśahasrebhyaḥ  
sarvavidyāntapāragah ||  
sarvavidyāvidkoṭībhyaḥ  
śivabhakto viśiṣyate ||*

One learned in the Vedas excels thousands of Brahmacarins; Certainly an *agnihotrī* (one who maintains the sacrificial fire) surpasses thousands of men learned in the Vedas; he who has performed sacrifices (*yajñayājīn*) surpasses thousands of *agnihotrīs*; he who has performed the *soma* sacrifice (*satrayājīn*) surpasses thousands of (*yajñayājīn*s); he who has reached the end of the other shore of knowledge surpasses thousands of *soma*-sacrificers (*satrayājīns*); a devotee of Śiva surpasses ten[s of] millions of the knowers of all [ancillary objects of] knowledge.

Further illustrations could be multiplied: compare for example *Śivadharmasāstra* 11.71cd and *Niśvāsamukha* 2.122cd:

## NĪŚVĀSAMUKHA

*akṣayan tad bhaved dānaṃ  
yad dattaṃ svalpam alpapi ||*

That [effect of] offering will be indestructible, even if (*api*) what is offered is very little (*svalpam alpapi*).

## ŚIVADHARMAŚĀSTRA

*atyalpam api kārūṇyād  
dattaṃ bhavati cākṣayam ||*

If someone, out of compassion, were to make even a trifle offering, [its effect] becomes indestructible.

Note also that the version of the *Lingodbhava* myth of *Niśvāsamukha* 1.72 ff. is close to that of *Śivadharmasāstra* 3.2 ff.;<sup>250</sup> the list of rivers (3.2 ff.) in the *Niśvāsamukha* is also close to *Śivadharmasāstra* 6.201 ff. and 12.108 ff.

One topic in which close correspondence between these texts might have been expected has been alluded to earlier in our introduction, namely the section listing the *pañcāṣṭaka*. For this list of the *pañcāṣṭaka* recorded in *Śivadharmasāstra*, we have collated two old Nepalese sources:<sup>251</sup>

*bhastrāpadaṃ<sup>252</sup> rudraḥkoṭir avimuktaṃ<sup>253</sup> mahālayam |  
gokarṇaṃ bhadraḥkarṇaṃ ca suvarṇākṣo 'tha dīptimān ||  
sthāneśvaraś<sup>254</sup> ca vikhyātas triṣu lokeṣu viśrutaḥ |  
sthānāṣṭakam idaṃ jñeyaṃ rudraḥkṣetraṃ mahodayam ||  
bhastrāpadādīsthānāntam<sup>255</sup> rudrasāyojyakāraṇaṃ |  
chagaraṇḍaṃ<sup>256</sup> dviraṇḍaṃ ca<sup>257</sup> mākoṭaṃ maṇḍaleśvaraḥ ||  
kālañjaraṃ<sup>258</sup> śaṅkukarṇaṃ sthaleśvaraḥ<sup>259</sup> sthūleśvaraḥ<sup>260</sup> |  
pavitrāṭakam ity etat mahāpūṇyavivardhanaḥ<sup>261</sup> ||  
mṛtāḥ prayānti tatṛiva<sup>262</sup> śivasya paramaṃ padaṃ<sup>263</sup> |*

<sup>250</sup> See KAFLE (2013) for more details.

<sup>251</sup> These are MS 1028/4 (=N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>), 46v6–47r3 and MS 1082/3 (= N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>) 40v6–41r1. One may compare the text with *Niśvāsamukha* 3.19 ff. See also p. 58 ff. of this study.

<sup>252</sup> bhastrāpadaṃ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; vastrāpadaṃ N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>253</sup> °koṭir N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; °koṭim N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>254</sup> sthāneśvaraś N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>; sthāliśvaraś N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>255</sup> °vantaṃ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; °vanta° N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>256</sup> chagaraṇḍaṃ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; chatalaṇḍaṃ N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>257</sup> conj.; vilaṇḍaṃ ca N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>; duraṇḍaś ca N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>258</sup> kālañjaraṃ em.; kāliñjaraṃ N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>; kālajjaraṃ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>259</sup> sthaleśvaraḥ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; sthāleśvaraṃ N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>260</sup> sthūleśvaraḥ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; sthūleśvaraṃ N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>261</sup> °vivardhanaḥ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; --- N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>262</sup> mṛtāḥ prayānti tatṛiva N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; lac N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>263</sup> śivasya paramaṃ padaṃ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; śivasya parama pa — N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

*gayā caiva kurukṣetraṃ nakhalam kanakhalam tathā ||*  
*vimalam cātṭahāsaṃ ca mähendraṃ bhāmam aṣṭakam*<sup>264</sup> |  
*etad guhyāṣṭakam nāma sarvapāpavimocanam ||*  
*gatvā tu puruṣaḥ strīmān prāpnoti śivamandiram |*  
*śrīparvataṃ hariścandraṃ jalpam amrātikeśvaram*<sup>265</sup> ||  
*madhyamaṃ ca mahākālam kedāraṃ bhairavaṃ tathā*<sup>266</sup> |  
*etad guhyātiguhyam ca*<sup>267</sup> *aṣṭakam parikīrttitam*<sup>268</sup> ||  
*santārya ca*<sup>269</sup> *pitṛn sarvān śivaṃ yānti param padam*<sup>270</sup> |  
*amareśvaraṃ*<sup>271</sup> *prabhāsaṃ ca naimiśaṃ*<sup>272</sup> *puskaraṃ tathā ||*  
*aṣāḍham*<sup>273</sup> *diṇḍimuṇḍiś ca bhārabhūtiṃ bhavāntakam |*  
*lakuliśvaraṇ ca*<sup>274</sup> *vikhyātaṃ tathā pratyātmiko mahān ||*  
*pratyāmikāṣṭakam idaṃ kṣatraṃ rudrasya kāmikam*<sup>275</sup> |  
*tara yānti mṛtaḥ sarve rudrasya paramaṃ padam*<sup>276</sup> ||  
*dānāny āvasathaṃ kūpaṃ udyānaṃ devatākulam |*  
*tirtheṣu yāni yaḥ kuryāt so 'kṣayaṃ phalam āpnuyāt ||*

It immediately becomes apparent that the order here differs from that of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Instead, it reveals close links to the list of the *Mālinīvijayottara-tantra* and the *Svāyaṃbhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha* (see GOODALL 2004: 315). It seems that the list in the *Śivadharmasāstra* has not served the *Niśvāsamukha* as source for adaptation. An important feature of this list of ogloads in the *Śivadharmasāstra* is that it attributes a different name to each set of eight pilgrimage sites, which are inserted by way of an additional line after each set of eight. As we have seen earlier, the *Guhyasūtra* proceeds in a similar, though not entirely identical, manner. Although stratification of the cosmological system is current in the tantric milieu, subdivision into ‘levels’ is traceable to both tantric and non-tantric Śaiva sources. Hence we cannot attribute such lists to one or other genre simply on the basis of a stratified cosmology.

While the list of the *pañcaṣṭaka* does not constitute a close point of connectivity between the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Śivadharmasāstra*, the other cases listed above

<sup>264</sup> mā --- N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>; mahendraṃ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>265</sup> jalpama° N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; jalpa — N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>266</sup> madhya° N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; ma --- ya° N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>267</sup> °tiguhyam N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; °diguhyakam N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>268</sup> aṣṭakam N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>; aṣṭakam N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>269</sup> ca N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>; tu N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>270</sup> yānti N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>; śānti N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>271</sup> amareśvaraṃ N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup> (hypermetrical); amreśvaraṃ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>272</sup> naimiśaṃ N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; naimiśa N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>273</sup> aṣāḍham N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; aṣāḍhi° N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>274</sup> °śvaraṇ ca N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>; °śvaro 'tha N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>275</sup> kṣatraṃ rudrasya kāmikam N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>; kṣatraṃ rudrasya hitakāmikam N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>

<sup>276</sup> padam N<sub>82</sub><sup>K</sup>; pamam N<sub>28</sub><sup>K</sup>

do imply close textual affinity, and it seems likely that the *Niśvāsamukha* borrowed these portions of text from the *Śivadharmasāstra* for the reasons listed above. If the *Śivadharmasāstra* was indeed the basis for these parallels as they appear in the *Niśvāsamukha*, then the *Niśvāsamukha* must have been composed after the compilation of the *Śivadharmasāstra* in the sixth or seventh century.<sup>277</sup>

### Borrowings from the *Niśvāsamukha* by the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*

Let us now consider the textual development which the *Niśvāsamukha* underwent after its composition. Thanks to the initial observations of Mr. SAMBANDHAŚIVĀCĀRYA and A. K. ACHARYA, we have been able to gather clear evidence that the *Niśvāsamukha* also served as template from which a later text, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, borrowed. The title of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is directly indicative of the nature of the text it contains, since *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* literally means ‘collection of teachings of Śiva’, suggesting that it comprises teachings gathered from earlier Śaiva sources. This initial impression is directly reinforced by an explicit attestation, penned by the author (1.3), that it is on the basis of the kernel of the compositions of Śaṃbhu, Sanatkumāra, Vāyu and Dvaipāyana that he composed (*kriyate*) the ensuing compendium of teachings *Dharmasaṅgraha* (i.e. the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*):

*sambhoḥ sanatkumārasya vāyor dvaipāyanasya ca |*  
*granthasāraṃ samuddhṛtya kriyate dharmasaṅgrahaḥ || 1.3 ||*

The [*Śiva*] *dharmasaṅgraha* is composed upon having extracted the essence of the scriptures of Śaṃbhu, Sanatkumāra, Vāyu and Dvaipāyana.

Among the twelve chapters of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, the first three chapters, which have now been edited by A. K. ACHARYA,<sup>278</sup> comprise moralising or sermonising counsel, in the form of ‘well-spoken advice’ (*subhāṣitas*). Chapter 4 then gives a description of the hells, the *narakas*, which exhibits a certain degree of correspondence with the *Skandapurāṇa*: some of its verses are identical with their counterparts in chapters 37–47 of the *Skandapurāṇa*.<sup>279</sup> Chapters 5 to 9 closely parallel parts of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Chapters 10 to 12 present the Purāṇic cosmography; chapter 10 is nearly identical to the fifth chapter of the *Guhyasūtra*; chapter 11 of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* has considerable overlap with parts of the sixth and seventh chapters of the *Guhyasūtra*;<sup>280</sup> finally, chapter 12 corresponds to verses 209–355 of the thirty-ninth chapter of the *Vāyupurāṇa*.

<sup>277</sup> See fn. 246.

<sup>278</sup> A. K. ACHARYA (2009\*).

<sup>279</sup> See BAKKER, BISSCHOP & YOKOCHI (2014: 82–95).

<sup>280</sup> The *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* appears to be the first text of the *Śivadharm*-corpus to incorporate tantric material. It does so by drawing intensively from chapter five, six, and seven of the *Guhyasūtra*.



Clearly it makes sense to take the above-quoted introductory verse seriously—and to try and locate the texts upon which the compendium has drawn. To begin with, we may note that the scripture ‘of Śambhu’ may refer to the *Niśvāsataṭṭvasaṃhitā*, which we know to be ascribed to Śiva, since the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* demonstrably draws on the *Niśvāsamukha* and *Guhyasūtra*. As for the second author mentioned, Sanatkumāra, it appears likely that the author of the compendium had the *Skandapurāṇa* in mind, since this *Purāṇa* was supposedly narrated by Sanatkumāra. Regarding the textual evidence for this contention, the fourth chapter of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* displays parallels with the *Skandapurāṇa*. The third mention, Vāyu, plainly refers to the *Vāyupurāṇa*. As regards the final reference, since [Kṛṣṇa-]dvaipāyana (i.e. Vyāsa) is the purported author of the *Mahābhārata*, ‘Dvaipāyana’ could be a reference to the epic. However, this remains to be investigated.

### Extent and type of borrowing

It is important to mention here that, as we will show in the section below, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is not merely copying verbatim from the *Niśvāsamukha*. Instead, it standardises irregular forms and corrects awkward syntax. The underlying source text consulted by the author of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, it should be noted, comprises the Laukika and Vaidika sections of the *Niśvāsamukha*, from which, as we shall presently see, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* draws heavily. The *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* did not appropriate the Ādhyātmika and Atimārga portions of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

The following comparative table shows the locations and scope of the textual parallels between the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*:

Niśvāsamukha	Śivadharmasaṅgraha
1.1–1.57	—
—	5.1–5.14
1.58–1.63	5.15–5.20
1.64	—
1.65–1.87	5.21–5.43
1.88–1.92	—
—	5.44ab
1.93a–1.98b	5.44c–5.49
—	5.50ab
1.98c–1.100b	5.50c–5.52b
—	5.52c–5.54
1.100c–1.107b	5.55–5.61
1.107c–1.114b	—
1.114c–1.124b	5.62–5.71
1.124c–1.125b	5.72

—	5.73–5.75
1.125c–1.127b	5.76–5.77
1.127c–1.154	5.83a–5.110b
1.155ab	—
1.155c–1.156b	5.110cd
1.156c–1.158b	5.111a–5.112
1.158c–1.150b	—
—	5.113–5.119
1.150c–1.159b	—
1.159c–1.160	5.120a–5.121b
1.161ab	—
—	5.121cd
1.161c–1.162b	5.122
—	5.123
1.162c–1.165b	5.124–5.126
—	5.127
1.165c–1.169b	5.128–5.131
—	5.132
1.169c–1.171	5.133–5.135
1.172	5.136
1.173–1.176	5.137–5.140
1.177ab	—
—	5.141a–5.143b
1.177cd	5.143c–5.144b
1.178	5.144c–5.145b
—	5.145c–5.149
1.179–1.185	5.150–5.156
2.1a–2.18b	6.1a–6.17f
—	6.18–6.38
2.18c–2.35	6.39a–6.56b
2.36	—
2.37a–2.38b	6.56c–6.57
—	6.58
2.38c–2.39b	6.59
—	6.60–64
2.39c–2.41b	6.65–6.66
—	6.70c–6.76b
2.41c–2.42b	6.76c–6.77b
—	6.77c–6.78b
2.42c–2.43b	6.78c–6.78f
2.43c–2.46	6.67a–6.70b
—	6.79–6.88

2.47–2.48	6.89–6.90
—	6.91–6.94
—	6.97
—	6.105
—	6.107–6.117
2.49	6.118
2.50	6.106
—	6.119–6.122
2.51	6.123
2.53a–2.56b	—
—	6.138–6.153b
2.56cd	—
2.57–2.70	6.124–6.137
2.71a–2.80b	6.153c–6.162
2.80c–2.82b	6.95–6.96
2.82c–2.86b	6.98–6.101
2.86c–2.88b	6.103–6.104
2.88c–2.115	6.163–6.189
2.116	6.190
2.117	6.191
2.118	6.192ab
2.119a–2.120b	6.192c–6.193d
2.120c–2.121b	6.194
2.121c–122	—
—	6.195
3.1a–3.13b	7.1a–7.13b
3.13c–3.14b	7.13cd
3.14c–3.15d	7.14a–7.15b
—	7.15c–7.16b
3.16	7.16c–7.17b
3.17–3.18	—
3.19–3.22	7.17c–7.21b
3.23	7.22
3.24ab	7.21cd
3.24c–3.25b	—
3.25c–3.30b	7.23–7.27
—	7.24–7.40
3.30c–3.34b	7.41–7.44
3.35c–3.36b	—
3.36c–3.37	7.45a–7.46b
3.38–3.42	—
—	7.46c–7.52

3.43a–3.56f	7.53a–7.67b
—	7.67c–7.69b
3.57–3.69	7.69c–7.72b
—	7.72c–7.124
3.60–3.83	8.1a–8.25b
3.84ab	8.25c–8.26b?
3.84cd	8.26cd
3.85ab	8.26ab
3.85cd	8.27ab
3.86ab	8.27cd
—	8.28ab
3.86c–3.151	8.28c–8.93
3.152–3.153	—
—	8.94–8.108
3.154	8.110
3.155	8.109
3.156a–3.158b	—
—	8.111–8.114
3.158c–3.163	8.115a–8.120b
3.164	8.120c–8.121b
3.165a–3.177b	8.121c–8.133
3.177c–3.179b	8.134–8.135
3.179c–3.194b	8.136–8.150
3.194cd	8.151
3.195a–3.196b	8.152a–8.152f
3.196cd	—
4.1–4.7b	9.1–9.7b
4.8–4.12	9.7c–9.12b
4.13–4.14	—
4.15–4.16	9.12c–9.14b
4.17–4.19	—
—	9.14c–9.23b
4.20a–4.31b	9.23c–9.34d
4.31cd	—
4.32a–4.36b	9.35a–9.39b
4.36c–4.37b	9.39c–9.40
4.37c–4.41	9.41–9.44
4.42–4.137	—

**Table 2:** Comparative table of parallels between the *Niśvāsamukha* and *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*

From this table we can see that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* draws particularly on

the first three chapters of the *Niśvāsamukha* quite intensively. Other than that, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* also evidently borrows the first part of the fourth chapter from the Vedic section of the *Niśvāsamukha*. As we have noted in the opening sections of this study, the latter offers a stratified scheme of Five Streams, four of which are presented as inferior, yet conducive, preliminary stages which culminate in the soteriologically most rewarding path, the Mantramārga. No such idea—nor indeed any structured stratification of the content at all—is present in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. Instead, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, a text of lay Śaivism, overtly declares its much more limited ambition of simply compiling materials drawn mostly from Śaiva sources in order to present a coherent overview over the materials assembled. The rationale behind the impulse of composition of the two texts is therefore fundamentally dissimilar. Thus, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* omits a number of passages pivotal to the intentions of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Amongst these omissions are the following:

1. The frame story of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* (1.1–57).
2. Passages that do not accord with the setting of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* are omitted because the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is not framed as a dialogue between Śiva and Devī reported by Nandikeśvara. *Niśvāsamukha* 1.64 presents an illustrative example:

*evam śrutam mayā pūrvvan devyāṃ kathayato harāt |*  
*tat sarvvaṃ kathitan tubhyaṃ yat phalaṃ liṅgapūraṇe ||*

This is what I heard from Hara, as he was telling it to the goddess,  
and I have told it all to you, namely what the fruit of covering the  
*liṅga* (*liṅgapūraṇe*) is.

3. Those passages that directly reflect the conceptual framework of the Five Streams have also been omitted—with the noteworthy exception of the Vedic section.<sup>281</sup>

At present, we cannot fully comprehend the principles of selection of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. For example, the passage in the *Niśvāsamukha* which speaks of offering a black woollen garment and a buffalo (2.52–53), has been reduced to two lines when incorporated into the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. While this could be the result of a slip in transmission, it is possible that the redactor felt it was unnecessary to adopt it, although it is difficult to fathom why, for the section in question fits the context and is readily comprehensible. Other comparable cases could be cited.

<sup>281</sup> The passage of *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* 9.44cdef reads: *vedadharmo mayā proktaḥ svar-ganaiśreyasaḥ padam | uttareṇaiva vaktreṇa vyākhyātaś ca samāsataḥ ||*. This, we think, is the inadvertent result of careless borrowing: the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* does not claim to be sourced in any of Śiva's faces.

### Additions in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*

As the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is a compendium which draws on a multiplicity of pre-existing sources, it is to be expected that it features both interpolated and original material that does not originate from the *Niśvāsamukha*. In the following example, we see that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* integrates a substantial passage, of twenty-one verses, which is inserted in the middle of what is verse 2.18 of the *Niśvāsamukha* and which introduces both a new topic—the procedure for worshipping a *liṅga* made of sand—and a new speaker (Dadhīci). Most probably the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* borrowed this segment from another source where Dadhīci was the narrator. In doing so, the compiler-author effectively split a verse of the *Niśvāsamukha* in two. We have not been able to identify the source of the borrowed passage. There are further such examples, but we will restrict ourselves to just this one. *Niśvāsamukha* 2.18 reads:

*lakṣeṇaikenā gaṇatām koṭim abhyarcya gacchati |*  
*svaśarīreṇa sāyojyaṃ punaś ca na nivarttate ||*

By worshipping [it] ten thousand times, he will obtain the state of Gaṇa, and by worshipping [it] one hundred thousand times, he will obtain (*gacchati*) union with [Śiva] in his own body (*svaśarīreṇa*) and will never come back [to worldly existence] again.

In the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* this becomes (6.18–39b):

*lakṣeṇaikenā gaṇatām koṭyām abhyarcya gacchati ||*  
*dadhīcīr uvāca |*<sup>282</sup>  
*kiṃ phalaṃ bālukālīṅgasyārccanād api kiṃ bhavet |*  
*kathaṃ vā pūjayet karma vratañ caiva katham bhavet ||*  
*maheśvara uvāca |*  
*śṛṇu me kathayīṣyāmi bālukālīṅgam arcanam |*  
[...]

*etat purā mayā khyātam na deyaṃ yasya kasyacit |*  
*svaśarīreṇa sāyojyaṃ punaś ca na nivarttate |*

By worshipping [it] ten thousand times, one will obtain the state of Gaṇa, and by worshipping [it] one hundred thousand times, one will obtain (*gacchati*)

<sup>282</sup> Note that Dadhīci does not appear in the *Niśvāsamukha*. Either Devī poses questions to Śiva or the sages entreat Nandikeśvara to share his knowledge. In the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, Dadhīci appears in this isolated instance only.

...

**Dadhīci spoke:**

What fruit does one obtain from worshipping a *liṅga* made of sand? How is one supposed to worship it? What is the procedure [of worship]? And how should one practise the observance?

**Maheśvara spoke:**

Listen to me. I will tell [you] the [procedure of] worshipping the *liṅga* made of sand.

[...]

This [knowledge that] I taught earlier (*purā*) should not be given to everybody. ... [he will obtain] union with [Śiva] in his own body and will never come back [to worldly existence] again.

**Grammatical Changes**

One of the characteristics of the *Niśvāsamukha*<sup>283</sup> is that it shares features of *aiśa* language with the rest of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. We will show that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* has removed these archaic irregularities and replaced them with what are considered ‘standard’ Sanskrit forms. As the rest of the text of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is mostly written in Pāṇinian Sanskrit, we believe these changes were implemented in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* to smoothen out the text. This process of ‘streamlining’ grammar is typically more likely to be a shift from *aiśa* language to standardized Sanskrit—not the reverse. As a rule of thumb, textual parallels between texts displaying *aiśa*-grammar and texts with standardized Sanskrit should raise the suspicion that the standardised version is likely to be the ‘younger’ text and has borrowed from the non-standard one.<sup>284</sup>

We present here five types of grammatical modification in the parts of the text borrowed from the *Niśvāsamukha* by the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. These involve verb-forms, nominal forms, regularisation of *sandhi*, compounds and gender. We are confronted with changes of this type time and again throughout the text, and the examples quoted below are characteristic of a more widespread phenomenon:

<sup>283</sup> For a more detailed account of *aiśa* grammar, refer to p. 113 ff.

<sup>284</sup> Note however, that the *Manusmṛti*’s standard Sanskrit being reformulated along *aiśa*-lines in the *Niśvāsamukha* can readily be cited as counter-example to this general rule.

## REGULARISATION OF VERB-FORMS

- Correction of irregular optative: *dadet* (NM 1.60b) to *dadyāt* (ŚiDhS 5.17ab)
- Correction of irregular optative: *pūjye* (NM 2.30a) to *pūjayet* (ŚiDhS 6.50c)
- Correction of irregular *lyap*: *pūjya* (NM 3.160c) to *saṃpūjya* (ŚiDhS 8.117a)

## REGULARISATION OF NOMINAL FORMS

- Correction of irregular nominative: *kṛṣṇāṣṭamicaturddaśī* (NM 1.69d) to *kṛṣṇāṣṭamyām caturdaśyām* (ŚiDhS 5.25c)
- Correction of irregular numerical form: *triṃśabhir lakṣaiḥ* (NM 2.7c) to *triṃśallakṣaiḥ* (ŚiDhS 6.7c)
- Correction of irregular nominative singular: *parameṣṭhinaḥ*<sup>285</sup> (NM 3.65ab) to *parameṣṭhī* (ŚiDhS 3.65b)

REGULARISATION OF *Sandhi*

- Correction of double *sandhi*: *yoddharet* (NM 1.87b) to *uddharet* (ŚiDhS 5.43b)
- Correction of irregular extended ending: *kuruteti*<sup>286</sup> (NM 3.58d) to *kurute tu* (ŚiDhS 7.70cd).
- Correction of irregular *sandhi* of the pronoun: *so dhruvam* (NM 4.16d) to *sa dhruvam* (ŚiDhS 9.14ab)

## REGULARISATION OF COMPOUNDS

- Correction of inflected form: *śaṣkulyāmodakāni* (1.164b) to *śaṣkulīmodakāni* (ŚiDhS 5.125cd)
- Justifying an otiose *sa* : *guḍakṣīrasapāyasaiḥ* (NM 3.80d) to *guḍakṣīraiḥ sapāyasaiḥ* (ŚiDhS 8.21d)

## REGULARISATION OF GENDER

- Correction of irregular masculine to standard neuter: *°puṣpaḥ* (NM 1.147d) to *°puṣpam* (ŚiDhS 5.103b)
- Correction of irregular neuters to regular masculines: *kumbhīpākan tu nirayan* (NM 2.44c) to *kumbhīpākas tu nirayo* (ŚiDhS 6.68a)

<sup>285</sup> This form is the same in accusative plural and genitive singular too. Consulting other instances (*Niśvāsamukha* 1.58b, 1.115d, 2.34d etc.) we could derive that this is more likely to be a nominative singular.

<sup>286</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 122.



## SYNTACTICAL CHANGES

The *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* does not merely correct obvious grammatical mistakes in the borrowed text, but also changes the syntax substantially with the intention of clarifying the original text. There are many instances of this type of syntactical change, and most of these will be discussed in the notes to the translation of the *Niśvāsamukha*. But let us quote one example showing how the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* corrects awkward syntax and irregular morphology:

*Niśvāsamukha* (4.15c–16b)

*asvayanīkṛtavāṇījye bhūtādroheṇa jīvate ||*  
*japti juhōti vā nityaṃ sa svarggaphalabhāg bhavet |*

Without engaging in trade, he lives without harming living beings. He should regularly do mantra-recitation (*japti*) and (*vā*) perform oblations; [by doing so] he will partake of the fruit of heaven.

*Śivadharmasaṅgraha* (9.13)

*vāṇījyādi tyajet karma bhūtadrohaṇ ca sarvadā |*  
*japāgnihomasamyuktaḥ sa svarggaphalabhāg bhavet ||*

He should avoid participating in such activities as trade, and [should] always [avoid] harming living beings. Engaged in mantra-recitation and fire-oblations, he will partake of the fruit of heaven.

Here the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* corrects *asvayanīkṛtavāṇījye*, apparently used as a foreshortened instrumental, to *vāṇījyādi tyajet karma*, then replaces *bhūtādroheṇa jīvate*, with *bhūtadrohaṇ ca sarvadā*. As for *japti juhōti vā nityaṃ* (where *japti* is used for *japati* and both verbs should be optative or marked in some way as being part of a conditional clause), it is replaced by *japāgnihomasamyuktaḥ*.

## Alteration of Content

Comparing the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* and the source passages of the *Niśvāsamukha*, in some cases, we detect a modification of the meaning in the borrowed passages. These may be grouped in two categories, which we shall examine below:

1. deliberate alteration concerning rewards and
2. deliberate alteration of the essential meaning.

## MODIFICATIONS CONCERNING REWARDS

Especially with regards to the descriptions of rewards promised for engaging in religious practice, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* has considerably altered the passages it has borrowed. Typically, the religious practices themselves remain identical, whereas

the results ascribed to them are significantly different. In a few cases, it is possible that such changes are the result of graphic confusion while copying, as in the case of *śivālayam* (NM 1.82d)  $\approx$  *surālayam* (ŚiDhS 5.83d).

- Change of ‘Brahma-hood’ to ‘Skanda-hood’: *brahmatvam* (NM 2.7b) to *skandam*<sup>287</sup> (ŚiDhS 6.7b)
- Change from ‘attaining the world of the moon’ to ‘attaining the world of Indra’: *somapuraṃ* (NM 2.59c) to *śakrapuraṃ* (ŚiDhS 6.126c)
- Change of ‘the fruit of rejoicing in heaven’ to attaining the ‘world of Kāmadeva’: *divi* (NM 2.65d) to *kāmadevapuraṃ* (ŚiDhS 6.132c)

#### MODIFICATIONS OF THE FUNDAMENTAL MEANING

Occasionally, small changes make significant alterations to the essential meaning of the borrowed text, as in this example:

*Niśvāsamukha* (2.110)

*atidānavidhiḥ khyāto lokānāṃ hitakāmyayā |*  
*dine dine ca yo dadyād dānan tañ ca nibodha me ||*

I have taught the injunction of consummate offering (*atidānavidhiḥ*) for the benefit of the worlds. If someone makes an offering every day, listen to the fruit of that offering too.

*Śivadharmasaṅgraha* (6.184c-185b)

*iti dānavidhiś cokto lokānāṃ hitakāmyayā ||*  
*dine dine ca yad dānaṃ tac cāpi hi nibodha me |*

I have thus taught the injunction of offering (*iti dānavidhiḥ*) for the benefit of the worlds. [If someone makes] an offering every day, listen to the fruit of that offering too.

Here the pronouncement of the *Niśvāsamukha* is about a ‘consummate offering’ (*atidāna*<sup>o</sup>), a problematic term, as its meaning may differ from context to context.<sup>288</sup> The *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, by writing *iti dāna*<sup>o</sup> ‘thus offering’, makes this kind of offering disappear, and ends up with a different and more banal sense.

In sum, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* has often rephrased, replacing uncommon words, structures, and syntax. In doing so, it has banalised the text, but it has also often clarified it. The fact that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* chose to borrow from the *Niśvāsamukha* suggests that the *Niśvāsamukha* had acquired and still enjoyed

<sup>287</sup> We have taken Skanda in the sense of Skanda-hood here.

<sup>288</sup> See footnote to verse 2.105d on page 279.

some authority among Śaivas at the time the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* was composed.<sup>289</sup> If not, the redactor of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* would presumably have been less likely to draw upon it.

### Noteworthy Irregularities in the *Niśvāsamukha*

As noted towards the beginning of this introduction, the text of the *Niśvāsamukha* depends on outside sources to furnish a substantial part of its textual fabric. This becomes evident also stylistically, since the mode of expression varies greatly throughout the text. Some of the unevenness of the text may have been caused by the uneven process of recontextualization of loaned passages.<sup>290</sup> At the same time, the process of transmission may have added to the textual inconsistencies, as would have the introduction of ‘*aiśa*’ forms.<sup>291</sup> However, what might be worth considering is the possibility that at least some of the uncertainties about the text and its interpretation may be attributable to our limited knowledge of the community which produced the work.

As a first example, let us invoke *Niśvāsamukha* 1.51–52, which presents the five streams of knowledge and their goals in accordance with the Mantramārgic perspective:

*īśvara uvāca |*  
*pañca srotā mayā khyātā lokānāṃ hitakāmyayā |*  
*tān pravakṣyāmi sarvāṃs tu śṛṇuṣva vahitā priye || 1.51 ||*  
*svarggāpavargahetoś ca tan nibodha yathārthataḥ |*  
*laukikaṃ sampravakṣyāmi yena svargaṃ vrajanti te || 1.52 ||*

Īśvara spoke:

I have [elsewhere] taught Five Streams [of knowledge] on account of my desire for the welfare of the worlds. I will explain (*pravakṣyāmi*) all of them, o beloved one! Please listen attentively. And for the sake of heaven and liberation (*svarggāpavargahetoḥ*), understand this (*tan*) exactly. I shall teach [first] the worldly [stream] (*laukikaṃ*), by which people attain heaven (*svargaṃ*).

Viewed from a logical perspective, the above passage (*Niśvāsamukha* 1.51–52) contains a somewhat problematic statement, particularly as regards the Laukika stream and the Mantramārga. First of all, the fifth stream, which is not the subject matter of the *Niśvāsamukha*, does not topicalize either *svarga* (‘heaven’) or *apavarga*

<sup>289</sup> A. K. ACHARYA (2009: 91) argues that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* can be dated to the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries CE.

<sup>290</sup> SCHREINER, ed. (1997), in this regard, speaks of ‘textual interstices’ (*Textfugen*) and ‘textual hinges’ or ‘transition points’ (*Schaltstellen*), which constitute disruptive factors in interpolated materials, and moreover mark the contours of the borrowed passages.

<sup>291</sup> See p. 113.

(‘final beatitude’). Instead, it presents the somewhat parallel but nonetheless different concepts of *bhukti* (‘enjoyment of supernatural powers’) and *mukti* (‘liberation’).<sup>292</sup> Secondly, this passage clearly mentions that the Laukika stream professes to lead to heaven, and ‘heaven’ is designated as being (merely) a ‘worldly’<sup>293</sup> state. Despite that, we encounter a passage (1.86) in the same Laukika section that declares that union with Śiva (*sāyojyam*)—usually a supramundane state—results from bathing a *liṅga* with ghee for two years.<sup>294</sup>

It thus appears that the soteriological contours of the Laukika stream and the Mantramārga have been presented in a manner that has been not made fully consistent, and that there are instances of conceptual imbrication. To cite another instance, the passage spanning 1.118c–119b in the same Laukika section states that if one worships Śiva by offering a *muktimanḍapa* with devotion, no rebirth ensues—which again implies that the final goal of the Mantramārga can be achieved by means of a Laukika practice.<sup>295</sup> As in the case of the mention of ‘union with Śiva’, such passages in the Laukika section seem to contradict the statement of 1.52cd above that the Laukika stream leads merely to heaven. This inconsistency here may have resulted from the attempt of the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* to present these teachings of the Laukika stream within a Mantramārgic framework. In doing so, the author appears to attempt to confine the benefits offered by the Laukika stream to those of an inferior, preliminary stage, presumably in order to highlight the supremacy of the Mantramārga teachings. This attempt, however, leaves traces of doctrinal tension within the text as its corollary.

Another passage displaying a degree of logical inconsistency is the list of hells in 4.100a–105b. Because this extract is taught in a section that relates the views and practices of the Kapālavratins, it seems likely that this passage was borrowed from a now lost Kāpālika source. Although thirty-five named hells are listed, the list is

<sup>292</sup> GOODALL et al. 2015: 15, 32, 59 and 73.

<sup>293</sup> Refer to §2 on page 38 above.

<sup>294</sup> From this passage alone, one might doubt whether union with Śiva (*sāyojyam*) refers to a supramundane state of liberation, yet this is how it is used in another passage of the *Niśvāsamukha* (2.17–18): that latter section intimates that by obtaining union with [Śiva] one is never reborn, showing that there is no difference between union with Śiva and final liberation:

*saccakena tu liṅgāni pārthivāni tu kārayet |*  
*sahasrapūjanāt so hi labhate īpsitaṃ phalam ||*  
*lakṣeṇaikena gaṇatām koṭim abhyarcya gacchati |*  
*svaśarīreṇa sāyojyaṃ punaś ca na nivarttate ||*

If someone makes [and worships] earthen *liṅgas* made from a mould (*saccakena*) a thousand times, he will certainly (*hi*) obtain the desired fruits. By worshipping [it] ten thousand times, he will obtain the state of Gaṇa, and by worshipping [it] one hundred thousand times, he will obtain (*gacchati*) union with [Śiva] in his own body (*svaśarīreṇa*) and will never come back [to worldly existence] again.

<sup>295</sup> *Niśvāsamukha* 1.118c–119b: *muktimanḍapadānena bhaktyā tu yo ’rcayec chivam ||*  
*na tasya punar āvṛttir ggaṇaś caivottamo bhavet |*

followed by the assertion that there are thirty-two (4.105cd). Since thirty-two is a standard number featuring abundantly in the Mantramārga system,<sup>296</sup> it is possible that the author of this passage therefore favoured that number. We therefore guess that the last line (4.105cd) in the following passage might have been added without previously counting the number of items in the list—or possibly with a generous *laissez-faire* attitude that would allow for a few of the individual hells to be grouped together under one rubric. The passage reads as follows:

*avīcī kṛminicayo vaitaraṇī kūṭaśālmali |*  
*gīrīyamala ucchvāso nirucchvāso hy athāparaḥ || 4.100 ||*  
*pūtimāṃsadravaś caiva trapus taptajatus tathā |*  
*paṃkālayo 'sthibhaṅgaś ca krakacacchedam eva ca || 4.101 ||*  
*medo'sṛkpūyahradaś ca tīkṣṇāyastuṇḍam eva ca |*  
*aṅgārārāśibhuvanaḥ śakuniś cāmbaṛīśakaḥ || 4.102 ||*  
*--- 'nyā hy asitālavanas tathā |*  
*sūcīmukhaḥ kṣuradhāraḥ kālasūtro 'tha parvataḥ || 4.103 ||*  
*padmaś caiva samākhyāto mahāpadmas tathaiva ca |*  
*apāko sāra uṣṇaś ca sañjīvanasujīvanau || 4.104 ||*  
*śītatamondhatamasau mahārauravarauravau |*  
***dvātriṃśad ete narakā mayā devi prakīrtitāḥ || 4.105 ||***

[1] Avīcī, [2] Kṛminicaya, [3] Vaitaraṇī, [4] Kūṭaśālmali, [5] Gīrīyamala, [6] Uchhvāsa, and then [7] Nirucchvāsa [8], Pūtimāṃsadrava, [9] Trapu, [10] Taptajatu then [11] Paṃkālaya, [12] Asthibhaṅga, [13] Krakacaccheda and [14] Medo'sṛkpūyahrada, [15] Tīkṣṇāyastuṇḍa, then [16] Aṅgārārāśibhuvana, [17] Śakuni, [18] Ambarīśaka, [19] Asitāladruma, [20] Asitālavana, then [21] Sūcīmukha, [22] Kṣuradhāra, [23] Kālasūtra, then [24] Parvata, then [25] Padma is taught, then [26] Mahāpadma, then [27] Apāka, [28] Sāra, [29] Uṣṇa, [30] Sañjīvana, [31] Sujīvana, [32] Śītatamas, [33] Andhatamas, [34] Mahāraurava and [35] Raurava; **I have taught, o goddess, these thirty-two hells.**

It is to be noted that a list of thirty-two hells found in the inscription of the Angkor Vat bas-relief is particularly close to the list of the hells of the *Niśvāsamukha* both in names and ordering principle applied.<sup>297</sup>

The *Aṣṭamūrti*-hymn in *Niśvāsamukha* 1.30–41 arguably does not smoothly fit the context in which it occurs and is perhaps also interpolated from a different source. Note, first of all, that the hymn features a *phalaśruti*, which is typically included at the end of self-contained texts. Secondly, were this portion removed—as

<sup>296</sup> See SANDERSON 2003-4: 422 and GOODALL 2004: 282–283, fn. 487.

<sup>297</sup> See SANDERSON 2003-4: 422. The list of hells found in Angkor Vat may therefore be further evidence of knowledge of the *Niśvāsa*-corpus being transmitted beyond the Indian subcontinent (SANDERSON 2001: 7–8, fn. 5), for we already know from Khmer inscriptions that the *Niśvāsa* was known and employed among royalty in rituals.

will be shown in the following extract—the preceding (1.29) and the following textual segment (1.42) of the *Niśvāsamukha* appear to interlock seamlessly, with Nandin first introducing a question of the goddess and then supplying that question:

*mahādevyā yathā prṣṭas sarvvaduḥkhaharo haraḥ |*  
*tathā vakṣyāmi vipreindrāḥ praṇipatya śivam śuciḥ || 1.29 ||*

[...]—[ostensibly interpolated passage]

*devy uvāca |*  
*anādinidhano devo hy ajam akṣaram avyayaḥ |*  
*sarvagat sarvarūpo 'si sarvajñaś caikakāraṇaḥ || 1.42 ||*

I will teach, o best among Brāhmins, just as Śiva, the destroyer of all suffering [did], when requested by the great goddess after prostrating before Śiva and purifying myself.

[...]—[ostensibly interpolated passage]

Devī spoke: You are the god [having] no beginning, nor end (*anādinidhano*), devoid of birth and destruction, imperishable, all-pervading and having all forms. You are omniscient [and] the sole cause [of the whole universe].

At first glance, not all the unevennesses in the text appear to have arisen due to textual borrowing—some may rather have occurred during the course of the subsequent transmission of the text. To cite one possible example: in a passage where the rewards for worshipping different deities are indicated, the verse relating the worship of Kubera on the third day of the fortnight lacks such an explanation of the reward for worshipping the deity:

*tr̥tīyāyāṃ tu sampūjya yakṣam hemamayān gadām |*  
*nāmāny ālikhya dātavyā bhājane ghṛtapūrite || 3.164 ||*  
*caturthīyān dantīnan dadyāt sauvarṇṇan nāma-cāṅkitam |*  
*vighneśvarasya devasya ghṛtapūrṇṇodumbare sthitam || 3.165 ||*

Having [first] worshipped Kubera (*yakṣam*) on the third day [of the fortnight], one should give a golden mace [to a Brāhmin], writing the names of [Kubera on it and putting it] in a vessel filled with clarified butter. On the fourth day [of the fortnight], one should give a golden elephant marked with the names of the god Vighneśvara placed in [a vessel made of] *udumbara* wood.

Instead of relating the reward for performing the worship of Kubera, as expected, the text proceeds at once to relate the worship of Vighneśvara. Since we are presumably missing a single line here, one possible explanation is that it might have been left out by a transmitter as a result of eye-skip. However, the fact that the very same segment—mention of the rewards for worshipping a particular deity—is

again missing in the instance of the worship of Devī,<sup>298</sup> we should mention another possible scenario. Since such a coincidence would be arguably unlikely to occur accidentally when copying, it is perhaps just as likely to be an authorial feature. Perhaps the author drew the exposition of performing the worship of diverse deities from one source and the respective rewards from another source, from oral tradition, from floating verses, or from his own inventiveness. In the process, the exposition of the worship of two deities—Kubera and Devī—may, because of oversight, never actually have been supplied with the corresponding rewards.

We may conclude our lengthy discussion of borrowings and parallels with the observation that the *Niśvāsamukha* is plainly a syncretic composition—one whose hybrid nature, by the way, cannot simply be described by the label ‘Mantramārgic Śaivism’. But it is hard to judge to what extent irregularities of the text are authorial, and to what extent they are caused by scribal error during the process of transmission. This is all the more difficult since we have only a single manuscript witness to the text.

## Structural Overview and Summary of Content

The *Niśvāsamukha* is divided into four chapters (*paṭalas*). The first begins with the frame story in which the entirety of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* is enveloped. Thereafter, the Five Streams of knowledge are briefly taught, after which lay religious duties are expounded, ending with the worshipping of the *liṅga* and the rewards of doing so. The second chapter relates how to fashion different kinds of *liṅgas*, installing them and worshipping them on a daily basis, the rewards of such worship and various affiliated donative practices. The third chapter discusses sacred places of pilgrimage, the benefits of worshipping various gods and performing different religious observances. The fourth chapter relates the so-called Vedic, Ādhyātmika and Atimārga streams.

<sup>298</sup> Here is the account in question of the worship of Devī (3.177c–178):

*navamyām siṃha nāmena devyāś cābhyarcitena ca |*  
*ghṛtatāmrasya dānāc ca bhakṣaiḥ payaghaṭānvitaiḥ ||*  
*yamāya mahiṣan dadyān nāmāṅkan tu ghṛtaplutam |*

On the ninth day [of a fortnight], [one should offer a statuette of] a lion [after first] worshipping Devī by [calling out] her name[s], [and] also by giving a copper [container] of ghee and [some] eatables, together with pots filled with milk, [to a Brāhmin]. For [the worship of] Yama (*yamāya*), one should give [a statuette of] a buffalo covered in ghee, marked with the names [of Yama to a Brāhmin].

Instead of mentioning the expected rewards for performing this act of worship, the text instead immediately proceeds to describe the procedure for worshipping Yama.

## Chapter One

### [Frame story: the Five Streams]

Ricīka (=Ṛcīka) inquires of Mataṅga about a miracle that he had seen in the Naimiṣa forest. (1–4)

Mataṅga answers Ricīka (=Ṛcīka) in brief that Brahmā and Viṣṇu were initiated, and, upon hearing this, sages gathered in the forest of Devadāruvana/ (5–13)

Nandin is granted the authority to teach the sages. (14–17)

Ricīka (=Ṛcīka) asks Mataṅga how Nandin could be the teacher of the sages and how he could grant initiation to them. (18)

Mataṅga relates how the sages praised Nandikeśvara. (19–25)

Nandin initiates the sages and promises to impart to them the Five Streams of knowledge as they were revealed to Devī by Hara. (26–29)

Nandin bows down to Śiva and praises him in what is called an *Aṣṭamūrti*-hymn. (30–41)

Devī recites a hymn to Śiva. (41–45)

Devī informs Śiva about her compassion for afflicted beings and proceeds to ask how they can be freed from affliction. (45–50)

Īśvara gives a brief account of the Five Streams of knowledge. (51–56)

Devī asks Īśvara to describe the five streams of knowledge in detail. (57)

### [The Laukika stream]

Īśvara teaches the fruits of making a fountain of drinking water, creating a lotus pond, offering a house to a Brāhmin, making a garden at a temple, offering the gift of a flower or a garland, and covering a *liṅga* with flowers. (58–63)

Nandin reiterates what he had heard when Hara was teaching Devī regarding the fruit of covering a *liṅga* with flowers. (64)

The sages inquire about how the god is to be pleased and about the fruits of worshipping him by different means and with diverse substances. (65–70)

### [Worship of the *liṅga*]



Nandin tells of the fruits of cleansing a *liṅga*, worshipping it with different substances on a daily basis, such as leaves, flowers, fruits, curd, milk, ghee, *pavitra* (i.e. *kuśa* grass), and the sounding of ‘HUDDUN’. (71–76)

The fruits of bathing a *liṅga* with water, curds, ghee, milk, honey and with the five products of a cow. (76–97)

The fruits of besmearing a *liṅga* with sandal paste mixed with camphor, burning *guggulu* in front of a *liṅga*, offering clothes, banners or awnings to the *liṅga*. (98–107b)

The fruits of offering a golden bell made of different substances, a yak-tail fly-whisk, a girdle and waist-cord, a crown, an ear-ring and a multicoloured fabric, a turban, gems, ornaments, adornments, and a *muktimanḍapa* to the *liṅga*. (107c–119b)

The fruits of performing the rite of besmearing with different substances, offering bracelets, armbands, gems, scentless flowers, and covering a *liṅga* with flowers. (119c–123b)

The beginning of the teaching of worshipping the *liṅga* with fragrant flowers. (123c–124b)

The fruits of offering a fragrant flower, the names of flowers, whose fragrance Śaṅkara [delights in], and the fruits of worshipping Śiva with them. (124c–128b)

The fruits of worshipping a *liṅga* with different flowers and the rewards for doing so. (128c–156b)

The fruits of offering leaves, flowers, fruit, water, grass, and milk to Śaṅkara daily. (1156c–158b)

Ranking of various types of flowers. (158c–159)

The fruits of offering different foods and songs. (160–165b)

The fruits of offering lute music, the sound ‘HUDDUN’, dance, mouth music (‘*mukhavādyā*’), and loud laughter to Śiva. (165c–169b)

The fruits of worshipping Śiva for those who have not received Śaiva initiation and for those who have. (169cdef)

Nandi tells the sages the significance of the *liṅga*, and states that this is what he heard from Hara as he related it to the goddess. (170–171)

[The *Liṅgodbhava* myth]

Nandi relates the famous *Lingodbhava* myth to the sages. (172–184)

The chapter concludes with the warning that prosperity is not possible for mortals who do not worship Śiva in the form of the *liṅga*. (185)

## Chapter Two

### [Temporary *liṅgas*]

The question of the sages to Nandi about the fruits of making a *liṅga* and installing it. (1)

The fruits of making a *liṅga* and worshipping it. (2–7)

The fruits of making a *liṅga* out of different substances, and thereupon worshipping it. (6–20b)

### [Donations]

The fruits of making a Śiva temple with marked bricks, and the fruits of making and worshipping the *liṅga* made of different metals. (20c–24b)

The fruits of planting trees and cultivating a garden. (24c–27b)

The fruits of constructing a temple and installing deities. (27c–30b)

The fruits of making a bridge, causeway, water-channel, hut, abode or pavilion, and of making donations. (30c–36)

The fruits of offering food and water. (37–39b)

The fruits of offering sesame and water to gods and ancestors. (39c–41b)

The fruits of offering the hide of a black buck. (41c–43b)

The fruits of performing *śrāddha* rites to ancestors. (43c–45b)

The fruits of offering a lamp and cows to gods and ancestors. (45c–48)

The fruits of offering a calving cow and a bull to a Brāhmin. (49–50)

The fruits of offering a goat, a garment and a buffalo to a Brāhmin. (51–55)

The fruits of offering land, gems, clothes, and silver. (56–57)

The fruits of donating sesame seeds, gold, pearls, or gems of various kinds and quality. (58–59)

The fruits of offering treacle, milk, curds, ghee, sandalwood, agallochum, camphor, cloves etc. (60–61)

The fruits of offering a virgin girl, grains and protection to living beings. (62–63)

The fruits of offering a woman and providing a feast of lovemaking with women. (64–65)

The fruits of offering a cane-seat, a couch, fuel, shelter, straw, a blanket and food. (66–68)

The fruits of regularly offering songs, musical instruments and vehicles to the gods, and of offering a horse to Brāhmins. (69–71)

The fruits of offering an umbrella, a pair of shoes, a chariot drawn by an elephant, a horse and a bullock cart. (72–80b)

The fruits of offering a mouthful of grass (*grāsa*) to cows. (80c–86b)

The fruits of letting a black bull, or any bull, free. (86c–88b)

The reward of offering various kinds of fruits. (88b–91b)

The fruits of offering tooth-cleaning sticks, fragrant betel, flowers and other fragrant substances. (91c–92)

The fruits of offering cushions made of *kuśa*-grass, different weapons, and vessels. (92–97)

The fruits of offering servants and maids to the gods or to Brāhmins; sea salt, piper longum, ginger, pepper, and dry ginger; and remedies for the sick. (98–100)

The fruits of offering sweet, sour, pungent, bitter, astringent and salty objects; oil, sugar or treacle, and thickened curd or buttermilk. (101–102)

The fruits of offering pearls or nacreous shells, cowrie shells, a mirror, nourishment, expressions of compassion or alms. (103–105)

#### [Hierarchy of recipients]

The magnificence of the donor and the characteristics of a true donor. (106–109)

The end of the description of the highest form of offering. (110)

The fruits of offering objects that are applied in daily use, cosmetics and food;. (111–114)

Devī's queries to Īśvara about the best recipient, and Īśvara's answer about the best types of recipients of gifts. (115–116)

Ranking of recipients. (117–122)

### Chapter Three

#### [Sacred sites]

Devī questions Īśvara about the merits of pilgrimage. (1)

#### [Rivers]

A list of river names. (2–8)

The fruits of bathing in different bodies of water, the mantra that is to be recited while bathing and its fruits. (9–13b)

The fruits of bathing while remembering Agni as the womb, Viṣṇu as the seminal fluid, Brahmā as the father, and water as a form of Rudra. (13c–14)

The fruits of suicide by abandoning one's body in rivers. (15a–16b)

The fruits of always recalling a certain pilgrimage site and of entering a fire (with the intent to perish therein). (16c–18)

#### [The *pañcāṣṭakas* and other sacred sites]

A list of five groups of eight pilgrimage places, and the fruits of bathing, seeing or performing worship and dying at any of them. (19a–26)

The fruits of seeing the god in Mahālaya and drinking the water of Kedāra with and without reciting the *vidyāmantra*. (27a–29b)

The fruits of visiting other secret (*guhāyāḥ*) places and of passing away at those locations. (29c–30)

The places where Hari is said to perpetually reside, and the fruits of passing away at those locations. (31–32)

The fruits of being a devotee of various divinities. (33a–34b)

#### [Observance of fasts]

The fruits of undertaking a fast until death. (34c–36)

The description of the fasts known as Sāntapana, Parāka, Atikṛcchra, Tapta-kṛcchra, Cāndrāyaṇa, Yaticāndrāyaṇa and Śiśucāndrāyaṇa observances, and the fruits of practising them. (37a–50b)

The fruits of fasting every other day, every other fortnight and every other month for a year. (50c–53)

The fruits of an observance restricting the intake of food to the night-time. (54–55)

The reward of not consuming honey and meat. (56)

The significance of celibacy. (57)

The significance of giving up all wealth. (58)

A list of unacceptable food items that are not to be offered to Brāhmins. (59)

Devī's question about the fruits of resorting to and worshipping different divinities. (60)

**[Worship of different divinities]**

Śiva's reply about the rewards of worshipping Brahmā, Agni, Kubera, Gaṇeśa, the Nāgas, Skanda, and Āditya—all in twelve forms (except the Nāgas)—on the first, second, third, forth, fifth, sixth and seventh days respectively of each month, starting from Mārgaśīrṣa and ending in Kārttika. (61–91)

The fruits of fasting and worshipping Śaṅkara, Devadeva, Tryambaka, Sthāṇu, Hara, Śiva, Bhava, Nīlakaṇṭha, Piṅgala, Rudra, Īśāna and Ugra, on the eighth day of each month from Mārgaśīrṣa to Kārttika. (92–106b)

The fruits of fasting and worshipping twelve different forms of Mahādevī on the ninth day. (106c–113b)

The fruits of fasting and worshipping the mother goddess for nine consecutive ninth lunar days. (113c–116b)

The fruits of worshipping twelve forms of Yama on the tenth day of each month, beginning with Mārgaśīras. (116c–121b)

The fruits of worshipping twelve forms of Dharma on the eleventh day. (121c–126b)

The fruits of fasting and worshipping Keśava, Nārāyaṇa, Mādhava, Govinda, Viṣṇu, Madhusūdana, Trivikrama, Vāmana, Śrīdhara, Hṛṣīkeśa, Padmanābha and Dāmodara on the twelfth day of each month for a year. (126c–138b)

The fruits of worshipping Viṣṇu for a year and for a lifetime. (138c–141b)

The fruits of worshipping the twelve forms of Anaṅga on the thirteenth lunar day. (141c–145)

The fruits of worshipping *Pārameśvara* in his twelve forms on the fourteenth lunar day. (146–150)

The fruits of satisfying the needs of the ancestors on the new and full moon days of Mārgaśīras. (151–154)

The names of the ancestors of the four castes. (155)

The fruits of fasting and worshipping Agni on a full moon day. (156–157)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping Prajāpati on a new moon day. (158–160b)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping Agni on the second day. (160c–163)

The procedure of worshipping Kubera on the third day; (164)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping Vighneśvara on the fourth day. (165–166)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping Nāgas on the fifth day. (167–169)

The fruits and procedures of worshipping Skanda on the sixth day. (170–172)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping the Sun god [on the seventh day]. (173–174)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping Śiva on the eighth day. (175–177b)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Devī on the ninth day. (177c–178b)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Yama on the tenth day. (178c–180)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Dharma on the eleventh day. (181–182)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Viṣṇu on the twelfth day. (182–185)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Kāmadeva on the thirteenth day. (186–188b)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping *Pārameśvara* on the fourteenth day. (188c–191b)

The injunction for honouring the ancestors on the new and full-moon days. (191c–195b)

The end of the section on worshipping gods and ancestors in Nandin's words, stating that this is what Śaṅkara taught Devī with his western face. (195c–196)

## Chapter Four

### [The Vaidika stream]

Devī's question about Vedic *dharma* to Īśvara. (1)

### [Injunctions for Vedic students]

The god's description of the observance of a *brahmacārin*. (2–6)

### [Injunctions for householders]

The duties of the householder and the distinguishing characteristics of a Brāhmin. (7–12)

The fruits of reciting the [Vedic] *saṃhitās*. (13–14)

The proper form of livelihood for a householder. (15)

The significance of reciting mantras, making oblations, and the consequences of not performing the five mandatory sacrifices. (16)

The list of the five sacrifices and the five slaughter-houses of a householder. (17–19)

The defining characteristic of an expert in the Vedic *dharma*. (20)

The fruits of meditating while intoning the *praṇava*. (21)

The conclusion of the observances of a householder. (22–24)

### [Injunctions for forest-dwellers]

The observances of the forest-dwelling stage of life. (25)

Further injunctions for a forest-dweller. (26–31)

### [Injunctions for ascetics]

The procedures for renunciation and the injunctions for an ascetic. (32a–40)

The end of the Vedic section, taught by Śiva's Southern face. (41)

### [The Ādhyātmika stream]

The beginning of the *ādhyātmika* section, taught by Śiva's Northern face. (42)

### [Sāṅkhya]

The cause of everything coming into being, according to the Sāṅkhya view. (43)

The emanation of the three qualities, the twenty-five *tattvas*, and the distinctive features of *puruṣa*. (44–46)

The conditions determining whether one is content or remains bound, according to the Sāṅkhya system. (47)

The end of the section on the Sāṅkhya view and beginning of the section on Yoga. (48ab)

### [Yoga]

The definition of a *yogin*, the right direction to face when assuming a yogic posture, the eight yogic postures, and assuming correct upper-body posture. (48c–51)

The definition of *pratyāhāra*, the purpose of practising meditation, the three breath-controlling exercises and their definitions. (52a–57b)

The section on the fixations (*dhāraṇā*) of air, fire, earth and water, followed by the sections on *tarka* and *samādhi*. (57c–67)

The result of practising contemplation. (68–69)

### [The Atimārga stream]

*The Atimārga stream comprises the following two schools of thought:*

#### [Atyāśrama]

The teaching of the first type of Pāśupata practice, called the Atyāśramavrata.<sup>299</sup> (70–88c)

#### [Lokātīta]

The teaching of the second type of Pāśupata practice, called Lokātīta.<sup>300</sup> (88d–130)

Conclusion by Śiva that he has taught the Atimārga in two forms with his Eastern face. (131)

Devī's query regarding the Mantramārga. (132)

Nandin's promise to pass on to sages the supreme knowledge of the Mantramārga that he heard while Śiva spoke to Devī with his fifth face, the Īśāna face. (133–137)

<sup>299</sup> For more details, see our translation and the accompanying footnotes.

<sup>300</sup> The reader is here referred to the translation of our text and footnotes thereon.



## Language of the *Niśvāsamukha*

The Sanskrit employed to write the *Niśvāsamukha* is often anomalous with regards to syntax and morphology, for it does not strictly to adhere to all the rules of standard Pāṇinian Sanskrit grammar. This type of slightly irregular language when used in Śaiva tantric texts is framed by the later tradition as ‘*aiśa*’ (*īśvaraprokta*), in other words ‘*that spoken by the Lord*.’ The underlying supposition is that, although such language is ungrammatical from the vantage point of human grammarians such as Pāṇini, it is nonetheless authoritative, since it is said to reflect the mode of expression of Lord Śiva himself. Kṣemarāja, the 11<sup>th</sup>-century Kashmirian author, for the first time, in his commentary *Svacchandatantrodyota*, refers to such linguistic oddities as *aiśa*.<sup>301</sup>

We find such non-standard usages of language in the Epics and *Purāṇas* as well. OBERLIES (2003: xxxi) observes that the “Epic language presents itself as a mixture of correct and incorrect forms, always met with side by side, within one and the same stanza.” In the case of the *Purāṇas*, such irregularities have also been discussed, for instance with regard to the *Skandapurāṇa*. The editors of the different volumes of the *Skandapurāṇa*<sup>302</sup> have listed numerous non-Pāṇinian forms which they find spread throughout the text. Similar linguistic features have been studied and discussed by SALOMON (1986) with regard to the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. Such irregularities in the Epics and the *Purāṇas* are known as *ārṣa* (*ṛṣiprokta*), in other words ‘spoken by sages’, by commentators of the Epics.<sup>303</sup> Franklin EDGERTON (1953) has carried out extensive research on deviant Sanskrit as it appears in Indian Buddhist Sanskrit texts.<sup>304</sup> His stance towards such ‘drifting forms’ of Sanskrit is that these are not incorrect forms but simply belong to a different register of the language.

How does this manifest in the *Niśvāsamukha*? This is most easily understood by listing types of non-standard usage. Some peculiar features of the *Niśvāsamukha* that may be described as *aiśa* are equally shared by the other books of the *Niśvāsa-tattvasaṃhitā*. We have indicated such shared characteristics with reference to the deviations noted in the edition offered by GOODALL et al. (2015: 113 ff.) in the list of morphological, orthographical and grammatical deviations from standard Sanskrit below.

A number of *aiśa* forms in the *Niśvāsamukha*, and indeed, in a large number of

<sup>301</sup> See GOODALL 1998: lxx–lxx (discussing the *Kiraṇatantra*) and TÖRZSÖK 1999: xxvi ff. (discussing the language of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*). Two further lists of such deviations from classical Sanskrit grammar have appeared recently in this series, namely those of GOODALL et al. (2015: 113 ff.) of KISS (2015:77–90), covering the more stridently deviant language of the *Brahmayāmala*.

<sup>302</sup> See ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER & ISAACSON 1998: 26–51; YOKOCHI 2013: 67–72; BAKKER, BISSCHOP & YOKOCHI 2014: 21–23; BISSCHOP & YOKOCHI 2018: 18.

<sup>303</sup> OBERLIES 2003: xxviii.

<sup>304</sup> EDGERTON refers to this type of grammar as ‘Buddhist hybrid Sanskrit’.

texts pertaining to the Mantramārga,<sup>305</sup> can be explained as resulting from the constraints of metre. Metre-dependent instances of *aiśa*-forms are commonly observed in several tantric texts, such as in the other books of the *Niśvāsa*, the *Svacchanda-tantra*, the *Brahmayāmala*, different recensions of the *Kālottara*, the *Mataṅga* etc.

In a few cases, we must consider the possibility that some forms are due to scribal variation, and did not originally form an intrinsic part of the composition of the text.<sup>306</sup> The foremost among these variations is *ām* used for *ān* in substitution of an accusative plural. For example in *Niśvāsamukha* 2.98, which speaks about the way to offer female and male slaves, it employs the phrase *dāsīdāsām ca yo dadet*, where the *ām* ending features in place of *ān*. Other masculine accusative plurals with a final *anusvāra* instead of the standard *n*, such as in 2.39c (*devān pitṛm samuddiśya*) and in 2.56cd (*yāvat sūryakṛtām lokām*), may also be similarly attributable to the same type of scribal style.<sup>307</sup> We have, however, decided to keep such scribal variations in the text, rather than emending them, and have done so in deference to the editorial policies established by GOODALL et al. (2015). Since our text is based on a single manuscript, we are hesitant to apply conjecture too broadly, and limit ourselves to the most obvious and compelling instances calling for editorial intervention. Thus we attempt to present the text mostly in congruence with the way it has been transmitted in the manuscript, and only deviate from that principle when good reason impels us to emend a reading.

Here we present an exhaustive list of types of unusual linguistic forms of the *Niśvāsamukha*, some of which are also shared by the Epics and the Purāṇas; note that we have left out deviant forms that we consider with some confidence to be scribal variations. Note also that we have not exhausted listed all instances of all types! For the discussion of individual cases see our translation and accompanying notes.

## Morphology of Nominal Forms

### Syncope of a *visarga*

1.70d (*upasannāh sma te vayam*) and 4.41b (*°naiśreyasa* for *°naiḥśreyasa*)

### Syncope of a vowel

1.58a (*utpānam* for *udapānam*) and 4.16 (*japti* for *japati*)<sup>308</sup>

<sup>305</sup> This is a feature that is already fairly well-established with respect to other texts, as shown by OBERLIES's (2003) analysis of the Epics.

<sup>306</sup> Some such scribal variations are discussed with reference to the *Skandapurāṇa* by ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER & ISAACSON (1998: 49–50). The editors of the *Skandapurāṇa* considered such readings to be traceable to the regionally coloured linguistic background of the scribes and did not form an intrinsic part of the original constitution of the text.

<sup>307</sup> For more examples see 2.63a, 2.98b, 3.166a, 3.171a, 3.187a, 3.187b, 4.8b (twice), 4.18a, 4.62a, 4.62b, and 4.111b. Cf. also GOODALL et al. 2015: 133.

<sup>308</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 118–119 and 123.

**Elongation of a vowel**

1.118a, 1.162a, 3.104d and 3.105d (*gāṇāpatyam* for *gāṇapatyam*), 4.8d (*hāvanam* for *havanam*) and 1.11d and 1.13b (*brahmāviṣṇumaheśvarāḥ*)<sup>309</sup>

**Prākṛtic vowel-shifts**

1.79c, 1.79a, 1.83a, 1.86c, 1.91a, 1.94c, 1.99b, 2.18c, 3.86d, 3.145c, 3.150c and 3.191b (*sāyojya* for *sāyujya*), and 4.95a and 4.126c (*vāgeśyām* for *vāgīś-varyām*)<sup>310</sup>

**Prākṛtic vowel with double abstract**

1.41d, 1.89d, 1.96b, 3.29a and 4.87d (*śivasāyojyatām*)<sup>311</sup>

**Shortening of vowels**

3.81a (*śarkara* for *śarkarā*)

**Singular for plural**

1.64c (*tat sarvvaṇ kathitaṇ **tubhyam***) and 1.170c (*mayāpi kathitaṇ **tubhyam***),<sup>312</sup> and 2.45b (*śrāddhakārayitā narāḥ*)

**Plural for singular**

1.58b (*pāpātmā **duṣṭacetasaḥ***), 1.115d (*citrapattapradāyinaḥ*), 2.34b (*nālīmārgaprayāyinaḥ*), 2.34d (*maṇḍapasya ca **kāriṇaḥ***), 2.45b (*śrāddhakārayitā **narāḥ***), 2.45d (*nityan dīpapradāyinaḥ*), 3.89d (*nirūjo dīrghajīvināḥ*), 4.78b (*vyaktāvyaktaikaikaṇḍinaḥ*), and 3.7cd (*tāmrā caiva trisandhyā ca **mandākinayaḥ parāḥ smṛtāḥ***)

**Plural for dual**

1.17ab (*yathā **te** sarvaśāstrāṇāṃ dīkṣājñānasya vedakau*) and 4.33b (*dīkṣu **śrotrāṇi** vinyaset*)

**Instrumental for locative**

4.123b *mūrdhnābhibhavapañcakam*<sup>313</sup>

**Locative for instrumental**

2.102 (*gavāḍhyo **goprapūjane***), and 3.76b and 3.166d (*yāvajjīve gaṇotta-maḥ*)

<sup>309</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 119.

<sup>310</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 127.

<sup>311</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 128.

<sup>312</sup> In both cases, *tubhyam* refers to the sages *ṛṣayaḥ*, for which reason we would expect *yūṣmabhyam* instead of *tubhyam*.

<sup>313</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 124.

### Nominative for locative

3.75d (*caturtthy ubhayapakṣayoḥ*) and 3.158c (*pratipad bhojayed viprān*)<sup>314</sup>

### Nominative for accusative

1.124d (*aśītikalpakoṭayah*) and 3.11a (*ayaṃ mantram anusmṛtya*)<sup>315</sup>

**Locative for dative** 1.24d (*tryakṣāya ṛṣisambhave*), 1.31d (*śīve namaḥ*), 1.157a (*pratyahaṃ śaṅkare dadyān*), three times in 2.38ab (*yastu grīṣme prapān dadyāt tṛṣṇārtte pathike jane*), 2.50b (*yaḥ prayacched dvijottame*), 2.53b (*mahiṣīṃ yo daded dvije*), 2.54d (*athavāpi dvijottame*), 2.75ab (*ga-jarathan tu yo dadyād brāhmaṇāya guṇānvite*), 2.100ab (*dattvā nirujatām yāti āture oṣadhāni ca*), 2.119d (*ekan dadyāt tu jñānine*), 3.59c (*tad brāhmaṇe na dātavyam*), 3.118c (*ugradaṇḍadhrte nityam*), 3.119ab (*śāsitre ca namas tubhyaṃ narakādhipate namaḥ*), 3.162c (*dadyād viprāya śobhane*), 3.175ab (*aṣṭamyāṃ vṛṣabhan dadyād bhavanāmāṅkitam dvije*) and 3.181b (*vṛṣan dadyād dvijottame*)<sup>316</sup>

### Vocalic *ri* for *ṛ*

1.1, 1.7 and 1.18 (*ricika*)<sup>317</sup>

**Feminine *ī*-stem as *ā*-stem** 1.107c (*hemamayān*) and 1.109a (*mṛn-mayāṃ*)<sup>318</sup>

### Feminine *ī* stem singular treated as a *yā*-stem

1.14c (*devyāyās tu tathā pūrvam*) and 4.135d (*devyāyā gaditam purā*)<sup>319</sup>

### Masculine for neuter

1.147d (*javāpuṣpas tathaiva ca*), 4.8c (*svādhyāyaṃ pratyahaḥ kuryāt*), 1.10c: (*taṃ śrutvā āgatāḥ sarve*), 2.14 (*labhen mahāntam aiśvaryam*), 4.45d (*bhū-tastanmātrasambhavaḥ*), 1.139a (*tān puṣpān*), 2.90a (*anyāmṛtaphalā ye ca*), 1.140c (*saugandhikādyā jalajā*), 1.155a (*nīlaraktās tu ye puṣpāḥ*), and 2.120cd (*yasya dāne na duḥkhāni narakapretasambhavāḥ*)<sup>320</sup>

### Neuter for masculine

<sup>314</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 125–126.

<sup>315</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 126. Note that in addition to serving as a nominative masculine pronoun, *ayaṃ* also is used as a nominative neuter pronoun.

<sup>316</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 125.

<sup>317</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 133.

<sup>318</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 118.

<sup>319</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 118.

<sup>320</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 116.

1.21c–22b (*devyāśaṅkarasaṃvādaṃ śrutam pūrvvan tvayānagha || saṃsā-roccittikaraṇam sarvajñānāmṛtottamam*) and 3.67c–68c: *vaiśvānaram jā-tavedam hutabhugghavyavāhanam || devavaktram sarvabhakṣam ghr̥ṇī ca ja-gadāhakam | vibhāvasuṃ saptajihvaṃ* (except *hutabhuk*, and *ghr̥ṇī*)<sup>321</sup>

**The feminine stem *ap* ‘water’ irregularly treated as an *a*-stem masculine in accusative singular**

3.100c (*āpam/apam* for *apah*)<sup>322</sup>

**Non-thematic ending**

4.23b (*°homasu*)<sup>323</sup>

## Compounds

**Member(s) in inflected form**

1.21c (*devyāśaṅkarasaṃvādam*), 1.130d (*bṛhatyāgastipuṣpakaiḥ*), 1.164b (*śaṣkulyāmodakāṇi*), 2.21d (*sphaṭirmmarakatāṇi*), 3.33c (*devyāmātara-ya-kṣeṣu*), and 3.34b (*japahomādyapūjanaiḥ*)<sup>324</sup>

**Otiose letter in the middle of a compound**

3.165b (*sauvarṇṇan nāma-cāṅkitam*), 3.80d (*guḍakṣīrasapāyasaiḥ*), and 3.82c (*gandhapuṣpasadhūpena*)

**Shortening of a vowel**

4.13c (*tryabdād gāyatrīśiddhis tu*) and 4.14a (*ṛgyajuḥsāmatharvāṇām*)

**Omission of a vowel**

4.29d (*parākcāndrāyaṇais sadā*)

**Lengthening of a vowel**

1.178c (*anānurūpaṃ yasmād dhi*) and 3.11b (*kuryān nadyāvagāhanam*)

**Reversal of the members in a compound**

1.33b (*mūrtyākāśa* for *ākāśamūrte*) and 3.140d (*maṇiratnavicitrakaiḥ* for *vicitramāṇiratnakaiḥ*)

<sup>321</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 116.

<sup>322</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 115. Sasha LUBOTSKY opines that it is theoretically possible to take *āpam/apam* as a regular feminine accusative. For further discussion, see our translation and accompanying footnote.

<sup>323</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 116.

<sup>324</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 129.

### ***Dvandva* followed by conjunction**

2.11c (*arccayen naranārī vā*) and 4.1 (*svargāpavargahetoś ca*)<sup>325</sup>

### **Elision of a word**

1.67c (*dīpacchatraphalaṃ brūhi* for *dīpacchatradānaphalaṃ brūhi*), 1.68b (*dāsīdāsasya yat phalaṃ* for *dāsīdāsapradāna/dānasya yat phalaṃ*)<sup>326</sup>

## **Morphology of the Verb**

### ***ktvā* for *lyap***

2.62a (*alan̄kṛtvā tu yo dadyāt*)<sup>327</sup>

### ***ktvā* for optative**

3.168ab (*pañcamyāṃ hemajaṃ padmaṃ dattvā viprāya bhojite*)

### **Singular for dual**

1.176ab (*punaś caiva samāgamya stotreṇa tuṣṭuve haram*)<sup>328</sup>

### **Plural for dual**

2.46b (*tāmisramandhatāmīsrāu narakā na bhavanti hi*)

### **The root *vid* (VII) ‘to find’ in the sense of *vid* (II) ‘to know’**

3.14a *vindyāt* for *vidyāt* and 4.47d *vindati* for *vetti*

### **Omission of final *t***<sup>329</sup>

2.30a (*pūjaye parayā bhaktyā*), 2.119a (*tasya dattaṃ bhave nantaṃ*), and 4.80b (*maṇṭe kuṇṭeti vā punaḥ*)<sup>330</sup>

### **Perfect for optative**

3.95c (*aśvamedhaphalaṃ lebhe*) and 3.11d (*dehatyāge divaṃ yayau*)

### **Optative for past tense**

1.172b (*pūrvavṛttaṃ hi yad bhavet*) and 1.173d (*kim etac cādbhutaṃ bhavet*)

<sup>325</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 129.

<sup>326</sup> Apart from these, there are other irregular compounds in the text, which do not fall into some specific category. These we list here: 1.54a (*bhakṣyābhakṣyaparīhāram*), 3.121a (*yāvajjīvārcanam*), 3.192d (*yāvajjīvākṛtenaiva*), 4.2c (*homajāpī*), 4.45a (*budhyahamkāras sambhūtaḥ*) and 4.122b (*harīrudradaśeśakam*).

<sup>327</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 122.

<sup>328</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 134.

<sup>329</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 132.

<sup>330</sup> Here *kuṇṭeti* presumably stands for *kuṇṭet iti*. After omitting the final *t* in *kuṇṭet* it becomes *kuṇṭe iti*. Finally, *kuṇṭeti* is the result of *aiśa sandhi* performed thereon.

**Irregular optative singular**

1.60b, 1.100d 2.42b, 2.52b, 2.98b and 2.104d (*dadet* for *dadyāt*), and 1.137b, 2.65b, 3.159d, 3.179d and 3.187b (*dāpayet* for *dadyāt*)

**Causative for simplex**

2.8b (*mṛdā liṅgan tu kārayet*), 2.17b (*saccakena tu liṅgāni pārthivāni tu kārayet*), and 2.107c (*jīvaṃ rakṣayate yo hi*)<sup>331</sup>

**Simplex for causative**

1.91c *snaped* for *snāpayed*

**Gerund for infinitive**

1.176d (*varan dattvā ubhāv api*)

**Active for passive**

3.76d (*yo ’rcayeta gaṇādhīpam*)<sup>332</sup>

***Sandhi*****Hiatus within a *pāda***

1.176d (*varan dattvā ubhāv api*), 1.188c (*sendrair ddevaiś ca asuraiḥ*), 1.185d (*ye martyā na namanti īdṛśam ajaṃ kṣemas tu teṣāṃ kutaḥ*), 2.8d (*labhate īpsitam phalam*),<sup>333</sup> 2.20b (*krīdante aṇimādibhiḥ*), 2.52b (*kṛṣṇāṃ vā āvikān dadet*), 2.62b (*kanyāñ caiva ayācitām*), 2.63d (*ye cānye abhayapradāḥ*), 2.74d (*yo dadāti upānahau*), 2.87c (*nīlasyaiva alābhe tu*), 2.100b (*ātūre oṣadhāni ca*), 3.123a (*ahiṃsā ca adambhaś ca*), 3.127d 3.128d, 3.129d, 3.130d, 3.132d and 3.134d (*tu upoṣitaḥ*), 4.2d (*bhaikṣāśi ca amaithunī*) and 4.38b (*anāraṃbhī ahiṃsakaḥ*)<sup>334</sup>

***so* for *sa* when followed by a voiced consonant**

2.31a and 2.33 (*so hi*), 3.195b (*so bhavet*) and 4.89 (*so bhramet*)<sup>335</sup>

***as*-stem turned into *a*-stem**

1.44d (*piśācāpsararākṣasāḥ*) and 1.183b (*apsaroragakinnaraiḥ*)

***as*-stem treated as *an*-stem**

4.81c (*paribhūtaḥ kṛcchratapā*) and 4.82a (*mahātapā ca bhavate*)

<sup>331</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 122.

<sup>332</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 122.

<sup>333</sup> The same irregularity occurs in 2.13b and 2.17d.

<sup>334</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 134.

<sup>335</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 132.

### No *vrddhi* when *a* is followed by *e*

1.19d (*śṛṇuṣvekamanā dhunā*)

### Double *sandhi*

1.87b (*yoddharet kulasaptakam*), 2.90a (*anyāmṛtaphalā ye ca*), 3.58b (*kuruteti*), 4.80b (*kuṇṭeti*), 4.115c (*svarlokan tu tatordhvan tu*), 4.116a (*satyaṃ caiva tatordhvaṃ tu*), 4.118c (*tattvasargam atordhvan tu*), 4.121c (*gahanañ ca tatordhvan tu*) and 4.121d (*viṅraheśam tatordhvataḥ*)<sup>336</sup>

### Hiatus-breakers

**m:** 1.11a: (*te dr̥ṣṭvā tvayi-m-āyāntā*), 1.38b twice (*hy aja-m-* and *akṣara-m-avyayah*), 2.46a (*tāmisra-m-andhatāmisrau*), 2.31cd (*nadīm vaitaraṇīm caiva-m-uṣṇatoyām mahāravām*) and 4.89d (*sa jaṭī muṇḍa-m-eva vā*)<sup>337</sup>

**r:** 1.185c (*varārthino -r-ahar*)

### Syntax

#### Anacoluthon

1.72–76 (starts with an optative and ends with a conditional; it is also an incomplete sentence); 1.77, 1.78–79, 2.38c–39b, 2.43c–44b, 2.56, 2.65 (start with a singular structure and end with a plural); and 3.178c–180b (starts with a singular structure and ends with a plural and also constitutes an incomplete sentence)<sup>338</sup>

#### Cumbersome syntax

1.87, 1.95, 1.135, 1.148–149, 1.152c–154b, 1.172–173, 1.178, 2.1, and 2.3ab, 2.33c–34b, 2.37d, 2.45c–46b, 2.56–57, 2.66, 2.65, 2.69, 2.85a–86b, 3.1, 3.69ab, 3.101c, 3.145cd, 3.148ab, 164, and 4.123ab<sup>339</sup>

#### Two correlative pronouns for a single relative

2.32c–33b: *setubandhan tu yaḥ kuryāt karddame pathi dāruṇe | dharmmarājapure so hi durggame sukhayāyy asau ||*

<sup>336</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 131.

<sup>337</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 133.

<sup>338</sup> Cf. GOODALL et al. 2015: 136.

<sup>339</sup> For particular awkwardness in the syntax in these cases, see the translation and footnotes accompanying these verses.



### Omission of relative and correlative pronouns

1.88 (*kṣīreṇa snāpayel liṅgaṃ kṛṣṇāṣṭamicaturdaśī | yāvajjīvakṛtāt pāpān mucyate nātra saṃśayaḥ ||*)

### Omission of a relative pronoun

2.52, 2.65, 2.68, 3.100, and 3.197

### Absence of case-ending for days of the fortnight

1.69d, 1.80b, 1.88b, 1.93b (*kṛṣṇāṣṭamicaturddaśī*), and 3.114 (*labhate sarvakāmāṃs tu **navamī**navamoṣitaḥ | maricaprāśanaṃ kṛtvā **navamī**navā yo 'rccayet ||*)

### Otiose repetition

1.110c–1011 (*śvetam raktaṃ tathā pītaṃ kṛṣṇam vā **cāmaran dadet** || hemadaṇḍan tu raupyam vā raityan trāpuṣam eva vā | **īdṛśāñ cāmaram datvā** rudraloke mahīyate |*), 1.130c–131 (*mantrasiddhim avāpnoti bṛhatyāga-stipūṣpakaiḥ || **yo rccayet** parameśānaṃ siddhakena samāhitaḥ | sarvakāmān avāpnoti **yo rcayed** gandhapūṣpakaiḥ ||*), 1.142c–143b (*jayārthe damanakaṃ syād **yo rccayet paramēśvaram** || nīrjitāḥ śātravas tena **yo rccayeta vṛṣadhvajam** |*), 2.90 (*anyāmṛtaphalā ye ca dattvā tu **subhago** bhavet | bahuputraś ca rūpādhyas **subhagaś** caiva jāyate ||*), 3.73c–74 (*lokapāleśvaraś caiva **yakṣendraḥ** parikīrtitaḥ | abdaṃ pūjayate yas tu yakṣaṃ bhaktisamanvitaḥ || dhanadhānyasamṛddhaś ca yāvajjīvena **yakṣarāt** |*), and 4.36c–36b (*tridaṇḍakuṇḍī cakrī ca naikānnādas sa **bhaikṣabhuk** || na tv asvam upabhuñjīta **bhaikṣavṛttisamāśritaḥ** |*)

### Ordinal instead of Cardinal Numbers

3.114b (*navamīnavamoṣitaḥ*)

### Other Irregular Numbers

There are some cases of irregular formations with regards to numbers as well: 1.86c: *dvirabdena* for *dvyabdena*, 1.167a and 1.167d *triṣkāla* for *trikāla*, 2.7b *viṃśabhiḥ* for *viṃśatibhiḥ*, and 2.7c *triṃśabhiḥ* for *triṃśatibhiḥ*

### Unfamiliar Words

There are also some lexical items the meaning of which we are not able to define:

- NM 1.51b *apsara* (denoting a flower)
- NM 1.151c *ditvākṣī* (denoting a flower)
- NM 2.102c *marjjitā* (denoting a flower)

### ***Aiśa* Forms Unattested Elsewhere**

Note that there are four types of irregularities in the above list of *aiśa* forms that had not been included in the overview of *aiśa* forms and usages published by GOODALL et al. (2015):

- **Gerund (*dattvā*) for infinitive *dātum*:** the occurrence is at 1.176d (*varan dattvā ubhāv api*). The context tells us that the gerund *dattvā* here fulfils the function of the infinitive *dātum*.
- **Optative for past tense:** In verse 1.172b (*pūrvavarttaṃ hi yad bhavet*) and 1.173d (*pūrvavarttaṃ hi yad bhavet*) the optative is used, although the contextual requires past sense.
- **Perfect for optative:** In 3.11d (*dehatyāge divaṃ yayau*) and 3.95c (*aś-vamedhaphalaṃ lebhe*), where one would expect an optative instead of the past perfect form attested to in this section.<sup>340</sup>
- **Absence of case-endings for days of the fortnight:** 1.69d, 1.80b, 1.88b, 1.93b (*kṛṣṇāṣṭamicaturdāśī*), and 3.114 (*labhate sarvakāmāṃs tu navamīnavamoṣitaḥ | maricapraśanaṃ kṛtvā navamīnava yo rccayet ||*)

### **Metre**

The text is written in *ślokas* (*anuṣṭubh* metre) with the exception of the concluding verse of the first chapter, which is written in the *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre. The style of the *ślokas* is defined by an abundant use of *vipulās*. GOODALL (1998: lxxi) observes in his discussion of metrical features of certain early Śaiva tantras, such as the *Kiraṇa* and the *Svāyaṃbhūvasūtrasaṅgraha*, that they are metrically plain and scarcely make use of *vipulās*. The *Pārameśvara*, *Mataṅga* and *Parākhya*, however, show more variation and make use of *vipulās* on occasion. Metrically, the versification of the *Niśvāsamukha* stands out, just like the other books of the *Niśvāsa*, when we compare it with other tantras. We even observe some use of *sa-vipulās* in the *Niśvāsamukha*. Instances of the *sa-vipulā* are expected to be rare, and their inclusion (instead of seeking to emend them away) may be questioned. Still, this form of metrical variation is also shared by the other books of the *Niśvāsa* and by the *Mahābhārata*.<sup>341</sup> Moreover, we noticed a few instances of hypermetry, hypometry and of lines that are in other ways unmetrical, which we have listed below. All of these instances deviate from the standard *pathyā* pattern:

- **na-vipulā:** 1.4c, 1.22a, 1.85a, 1.120c; 1.144c, 1.158c, 2.18a, 2.33c, 2.39a, 2.44a, 2.44c, 2.50a, 2.65a, 2.91a, 2.92c, 2.95c, 2.114a, 3.10a, 3.77a, 3.88a,

<sup>340</sup> It is to be noted that our text uses simple present and optative interchangeably.

<sup>341</sup> See GOODALL et al. 2015: 238–239.

3.105c, 3.159a, 3.171a, 3.177a, 3.194c, 4.32c, 4.36c, 4.37a, 4.82a, 4.86c, 4.100a (with irregular preamble),<sup>342</sup> 4.102c, 4.105c, 4.109a, 4.109c, 4.112a, 4.118a, and 4.132c

- **ma-vipulā**: 2.49a, 3.17a, 3.26a, 3.43c (with irregular preamble), 3.89c, 3.116c, 3.128a (with irregular preamble), 3.132a (with irregular preamble), 3.138a, 3.147c (with irregular preamble), 3.161c, 3.177c (with irregular preamble), 4.32a, 4.35c, 4.40c, 4.45a (with irregular preamble), 4.71a, 4.90c, 4.94c, and 4.99a
- **bha-vipulā**: 1.140c, 1.153c (with irregular preamble), 3.5c (with irregular preamble), 3.34c, 3.72a (with irregular preamble), 3.90c, 3.143c, 3.151a, 4.17a, 4.27a, 4.46c, 4.69a, 4.78a (with irregular preamble), 4.81c (with irregular preamble), and 4.105c
- **ra-vipulā**: 3.23a, 3.31a, 3.63a, 3.64c, 3.67c, 3.68a, 3.102c, 3.103c, 3.133a, 4.6a, 4.67a, 4.75c, 4.82c, 4.85a, and 4.102a
- **sa-vipulā**: 1.142c, 3.31c, 3.115c, 4.103c, and 4.122a
- **hypermetry**: 1.37a, 2.101a, 3.6a, and 3.67a
- **hypometry**: 1.84c and 3.64a
- **otherwise unmetrical**: 1.3d, 2.49a, 2.98c, 4.100b, 4.126a (the second and the third syllables are short), 3.93a, and 3.94c (the seventh syllable is short)

---

<sup>342</sup> We have not considered verse-quarters to have an ‘irregular preamble’ when all that is irregular is that the caesura (*yati*) is not in its expected place.

## Manuscripts

### Sources for the *Niśvāsamukha*

#### The Manuscript N

The principal source for the present edition is a palm-leaf manuscript transmitting the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, preserved in the National Archives, Kathmandu (NAK). The NAK accession number is 1-277. The Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP) have microfilmed it and the microfilm reel number is A 41/14. The size of the leaves of the manuscript is 50 cm x 4 cm. The manuscript consists of 114 folios written in the Nepalese ‘Licchavi’ script. Both the recto and verso sides contain six (occasionally five<sup>343</sup>) lines. The manuscript contains two binding holes, one to the left and one to the right of the centre. The manuscript is considerably damaged in the margins. The leaves were originally numbered in letter-symbols in the right-hand margin of the versos. These leaves have been paginated again at a later stage above the first binding hole in a different hand. There is a third hand that inserted correction marks to the second run of foliation below the same binding hole.

Although the manuscript is not dated, on the basis of palæographic evidence we can assign it, with reasonable confidence, to the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Various scholars have taken note of the manuscript, on account of its antiquity, and put forward tentative dates.<sup>344</sup> It has been variously dated from the middle of the 8<sup>th</sup> to the very beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. GOODALL et al. (2015: 103–108) have a lengthy discussion that is based on comparisons with other early Nepalese manuscripts, and in conclusion they propose the date of the manuscript to be situated somewhere between 850–900 CE, which is also the date earlier proposed by SANDERSON (2006: 152). We, for our part, suspect that this is a little too early, for we think that the date of the *Niśvāsa* manuscript is probably to be placed after the date of an old Nepalese manuscript of the *Suśrutasaṃhitā* that is dated to 878 CE.<sup>345</sup>

The only independent witness is the old manuscript N, but there are three twentieth-century apograph copies:

#### Apograph W

At the time of writing of this study, W is housed in the Wellcome Institute, London, bearing the Wellcome Institute Sanskrit MS number I.33. It is written in Devanāgarī script and also covers 114 folios. Both the recto and verso sides contain five to six lines. The foliation is located in the right-hand margin of the verso, and is erroneous in a few cases. The scribe supplies raised dashes in substitution for damaged or illegible letters. This apograph is dated *vikramasamvat* 1969 (=1912

---

<sup>343</sup> F.4r,v ,100r,v and 114v.

<sup>344</sup> ŚĀSTRĪ (1905), BAGCHI (1929), GOUDRIAAN & GUPTA (1981), SANDERSON (2006), GOODALL & ISAACSON (2007), and most recently GOODALL et al. (2015).

<sup>345</sup> See HARIMOTO 2014.

CE). The colophon states that the manuscript was copied in Nepal by a certain Bauddhasevita Vajrācārya. The post-colophon runs as follows:

*ida[sic] pustaka[sic] tāra[sic]patraguptākṣarapustake dṛṣṭvā nepālavāsi-  
bauddhasevitavajrācāryyena[sic] likhitam || śubham || | śrīsamvat 1969  
sālam iti āṣāḍhaśukla-aṣṭamīyām.*

This manuscript retains more letters than apograph K succeeded in glean- ing from the damaged portions of the original manuscript. This is most likely due to the fact that it was prepared at a time when the original manuscript was less damaged. The copyist appears to have remained as faithful to the original as possible, and unlike the scribe of K, avoided conjectures.

### Apograph K

This apograph is preserved in the NAK and is dated Vikrama *samvat* 1982 (=1925 CE). The colophon states that it was prepared at the request of Rājaguru Hemarāja ŚARMA during the reign of King Tribhuvana, when Candra Śamśera served as prime minister.<sup>346</sup>

The NGMPP reel number ascribed to the apograph is A 159/18, whereas the NAK accession number has been recorded as 5-2406. The text is written in Devanāgarī script on 114 folios and is of the following dimensions: 49 cm x 13 cm. Both the recto and verso sides contain between six to ten lines. The recto side of folio 104 is blank. The regular foliation is placed in the middle of the right-hand margin of each verso, with instances of erroneous numbering occasionally crossed out and corrected. There are three deviating foliations: in the extreme lower right-hand margin, in the extreme upper right-hand margin and in the extreme upper left-hand margin of the verso. The scribe leaves gaps for unrecovered letters, and provides dots when only a small portion of letters is visible. In damaged places, the scribe attempts to restore letters. Frequently he also provides conjectures, replacing irregular or non-Pāṇinian Sanskrit forms with their standardized counterparts, enveloping uncertain readings in parentheses. In a few cases, parenthesis-markers ( ) enclose empty space, sometimes in conjunction with dots ( · · ).

### Apograph T

This apograph is preserved in the Tucci collection in Italy. It is written in Devanāgarī script. The manuscript number is 3.7:1 and the folio size is 48.5 cm

<sup>346</sup> The post-colophon reads as follows: *likhitam idaṃ purātanajarattādapatralivitaḥ sam-  
uddhṛtya vikramābde 1982 pramīte śrāvāṇaśuklaikādaśyām samāpya sāmāśivāya sama-  
rpitaṃ [[ka]]virājani nepālabhūmaṇḍalādhiśvare śrīpaṃcakasaṃpanne tribhuvanavīravikrama-  
varmaṇi samabhiśāsati [[ca]] taddhīsacive śrītrītayasampanne mahārājacandrasaṃśera-  
jaṇḍavahādūrārāṇāvaramaṇi mahāmahodaye tadīyaguruvaragururājaśrīmaddhemarājapaṇḍita-  
mahodayānujñāyā tadīyasarasvatīsadanē nīveśitaṃ ca bhūyāḥ lekhakapāṭhakayor mude | śu-  
bham | maṃgalam | hariharau śaraṇīkaravāmī | iti śubham |.*

x 9.5 cm. There are 94 folios, fols. 1, 4, 5 and 98–104 of which are missing. Both the recto and verso sides generally contain five to six lines. The foliation is located in the lower right-hand margin of the verso (see SFERRA 2008: 60, fn. 132). The scribe provides dots · · · to indicate either damaged portions or unreadable letters. In contradistinction to K, these are not enclosed by brackets. Since the manuscript does not have a final colophon, its date cannot be determined from a textual declaration. Nonetheless, since the scribe has recorded fewer letters in the margins, one can surmise that N had deteriorated further by the time the scribe of this apograph began the process of copying it. It is therefore likely to be slightly younger than K and W. The scribe obviously had difficulty reading N, and given the large number of scribal errors, we have not drawn upon this manuscript, instead opting to discard its testimony.

### Sources for the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*

Since chapters 5–9 of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* closely mirror the *Niśvāsamukha*, we have included an edition of these chapters in an Appendix to this study. For this preliminary edition,<sup>347</sup> we have collated two Nepalese manuscripts and one printed edition. To provide a more detailed description of the sources, let us briefly introduce them at this point:

#### Manuscript A

This manuscript, dated to [Nepāla] Saṃvat 156 (=1035/36 CE),<sup>348</sup> is stored in the premises of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Kolkata. It is a palm-leaf manuscript written in Newari script and is damaged in the margins. The manuscript number is G 4077/3. There are 324 folios, and both the recto and verso sides contain five lines. The folios measure 53 cm x 4.5 cm in size and have two binding holes. The original foliation is placed in the left-hand margin of each verso, marked in letter-symbols. A later foliation, apparently in pencil, has been added in arabic numerals both on the obverse and reverse (distinguished as ‘a’ and ‘b’) below the left-hand string-hole. The manuscript contains nine separate texts: the *Śivadharmasāstra*, *Śivadharmottara*, *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, *Śivopaniṣad*, *Uttarottaramahāsaṃvāda*, *Vṛṣasārasaṅgraha*, *Dharmaputrikā*, and an otherwise unknown *Lalitavistara*.<sup>349</sup> Some archaic Prākṛtic forms, such as *sāyujya* for *sāyujya* are also preserved. Since this manuscript is ancient—just short of a thousand years old—it might have been expected to be more accurate than its

<sup>347</sup> We refer to our edition as ‘preliminary’ since there are many more sources that deserve consultation and collation. The three sources used for this preliminary draft do not suffice for a fully ‘critical’ edition.

<sup>348</sup> For the details of the stated date, see BISSCHOP (2018: 29, 56), DE SIMINI (2017: 1–2) & MIRNIG (2016a: 63).

<sup>349</sup> A. K. ACHARYA first identified the latter text (which, as we have mentioned before, is not to be confused with the Buddhist text of the same name).

apographs (or than younger witnesses of other transmission lines). Nevertheless, it contains numerous slips of the pen.

### Manuscript C

This is another multi-text manuscript, currently housed in the University Library, Cambridge, England. It is dated to Nepal *saṃvat* 256 (=1136 AD). The manuscript shelf number is MS Add. 1645, and the script is Newari.<sup>350</sup> There are 247 folios, and both the recto and verso sides of it usually contain six lines. Fols. 87-131 cover the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. The foliation is given on the verso, in letter-numerals in the left-hand margin and in Newari numerals on the right-hand margin. It contains all the texts found transmitted in Manuscript A, with the exception the *Lalitavistara*. This is the more reliable source of the two manuscripts collated for the present edition of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, as it contains markedly less scribal errors.

### Printed edition

The printed edition,  $E_N$ , is in some sections accompanied by a translation into Nepali, and also infrequently furnished by the editor's commentary. It was produced by Narahari NĀTHA in the year 2055 VS (=1998 CE) under the editorial leadership of Viṣṇu Prasād Aryāl ĀTREYA and Śrīśa THĀPĀ. The title of the book, *Paśupatimatam śivadharmasāstram paśupatināthadarśanam*, is a fancy of the editors. The tome contains the same eight texts as are included in the Cambridge manuscript C. It is poorly edited, and its text is construed on the basis of a single manuscript. The *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is to be found here on pages 323–433. See A. K. ACHARYA 2009: 114–115 for more details.

---

<sup>350</sup> The complete manuscript is accessible online at: <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01645/1>.

## Editorial Policies

Since a body of conventions for producing critical editions of the *Niśvāsa* corpus has already been established in the companion volume to this publication,<sup>351</sup> we intend to apply the same conventions in the present edition, both for the sake of consistency and because we hold those editorial conventions in high regard. There is, however, one major difference that needs to be noted: as mentioned above, the *Niśvāsamukha* has been copied by the author(s) of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*—and we have decided to include its readings into our edition of the *Niśvāsamukha*. This adds an element of complexity to the constitution of the edited text of the critical edition.

We have resorted to four sources in our production of a critical edition of the *Niśvāsamukha*: N, K, W and those chapters of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* which we have provisionally edited (chapters 5–9). It is the readings of the text of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* as constituted in that provisional edition that are marked in our apparatus with the siglum ‘*ŚiDhaSaṅ*’.

The critically edited text appears as the main text, i.e. the running text. The apparatus is fully positive and is divided into two registers. On pages that display both registers, the upper register records testimonia and parallels and the bottom register records the variants found in the manuscripts. Each entry begins with a chapter-and-verse number in boldface (e.g. **1.97**). Then follows the adopted textual segment as displayed in the main text, capped by a lemma sign ]. Immediately thereafter, the siglum (or sigla) referencing the source (or sources) of this reading is (or are) displayed. At this point, a semicolon separates the preferred (and adopted) reading (to its left) from the variants (to its right). The variants to its right are again separated from each other by semicolons.

Any siglum that is followed by superscript *ac* indicates the reading of a source before correction (= *ante correctionem*) and a siglum followed by superscript *pc* indicates the reading of a source after correction (= *post correctionem*).

When a reading is unmetrical, that is recorded after the sigla denoting the source.

When a portion of text is lacunose in manuscript N, we have marked it thus: ---.

If a portion of the text is missing in all sources except manuscript K, the segment in question is enclosed in two double square brackets [...].

---

<sup>351</sup> GOODALL et al. 2015.



When the scribe of manuscript K has expressed his own doubt concerning a specific reading as he had found it in the exemplar from which he copied, he marked these by use of single, round brackets. We have preserved this convention only in relation to this manuscript (=K).

If a textual portion is lost in all sources except manuscript W, that segment is rendered in between two double round brackets ((...)). If the reading is lost in manuscript N but preserved in both K and W, then its rendition is enveloped between two double square and round brackets: [(((...)))]. If a section of the text has perished in all manuscripts consulted, yet is retrievable from the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, the relevant passage has been adopted from the edited text of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* and marked as such in the apparatus.

The readings adopted from the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* are by definition insecure, since we have established that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* modifies the text considerably when borrowing passages from the *Niśvāsamukha*.<sup>352</sup> Nevertheless, we have preferred to insert the readings of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* into the missing sections of the *Niśvāsamukha* in order to allow for continuity in the unfolding of the text in a way that probably retains its basic meaning. We have, however, enclosed the reading of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* between double angled brackets (⟨...⟩) to alert the reader concerning those portions of the texts that have been supplied from the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.

When the text is omitted in one particular source we have placed *om.* just before the siglum of that source; for example: *om.* N. Textual segments enclosed within single square brackets '[' ]' are supplied by us; each folio-change and line-change in the manuscript is marked and placed within the same bracket; for example [3] stands for third line in the manuscript and [3<sup>v</sup>] indicates that this is the beginning of the third folio.

When we are not certain as to whether a reading that we record has been correctly deciphered, we have indicated this by putting a question mark (?) after the reading.

When the text is judged by us to be corrupt (which often means that it seems uninterpretable to us), we have put it between crux marks: †...†.

When apographs leave long dashes, we have marked them: —. If there appear two long dashes in one of the apographs it is marked thus: — —.

Portions of text lost to damage from the original manuscript have been marked with ---, whereas gaps deliberately left by the scribes of the apographs to indicate that the text was lost or illegible to them have been marked with □.

---

<sup>352</sup> See p. 98 above.

Where the gap is large and there is a possibility of counting the number of letters lost, we have printed an underscore-mark to indicate a hypothetical letter slot. For example, if five letters are lost, this is presented in this way:

— — — — —.

Any *akṣara*(s) that are enclosed between plus-signs (+ ... +) were added later—either by the same or by a different hand.

Any *akṣara*(s) displayed between two ‘x ... x’ signs in the critical edition had been written in the respective manuscript and cancelled later.

The sign ⊗ (*puṣpika*) stands for ornamental signs in manuscripts written before or after colophons. A list of all these symbols is provided at the start of the edition, on p. 131.

When there are scribal errors and other conspicuous mistakes, we have introduced emendations, marked with *em.*; ‘bolder’ corrections are marked *conj.* (conjecture). Of course, the difference is somewhat subjective. Conjectures occur when there is a complete lacuna in the text or when little is legible. When these conjectures have been proposed by other scholars, this is mentioned in the apparatus. When an *avagraha* is missing in our sources, we have silently supplied it.

The verse-numeration is more or less arbitrary. In most of the text, verses are divided up into four *pādas*. Occasionally, a verse is divided into six, either because there is a lacuna in the text (e.g. 1.17), or the context demands it (for instance because of a change of speaker).<sup>353</sup> At times, we have felt compelled to arrange the verses differently to the four-*pāda* system: since the semantics of verse 1.169, for example, spread over six *pādas*, we have chosen to format that unit accordingly, in order better to reflect the intended meaning.

The middle register contains testimonia, i.e. passages from other sources, older or younger, that display textual parallels and are sufficiently close to our text to merit our attention. The entry first lists the verse number. Testimonia are preceded by ‘cf.’ if the passage is sufficiently similar to the *textus criticus* of the *Niśvāsamukha*, or can contribute to its elucidation.

In our preliminary edition of the relevant chapters of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* in Appendix I, we have followed the same editorial conventions extrapolated above. Since what is signified by the use of square and round brackets does not feature in the MSS of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, square and round brackets are not employed in the appended edition of the latter work.

---

<sup>353</sup> For example, at 1.56.

## Symbols and Abbreviations in the Apparatus

- << >> Enclosed text is drawn from the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.  
 + + Enclosed text was added later by the same or by a different hand.  
 x x Enclosed text was first written and then cancelled later.  
     A number of letters lost in the manuscript.  
 □ Gap left by the scribes of the apographs.  
 --- Text lost because of damage from the original manuscript.  
     Long dashes in the apographs.  
 † † The text between these signs is corrupt (and typically uninterpretable to us).  
 ? Used when we are not certain about the reading.  
 □ Enclosed text supplied by us.  
 [[]] Enclosed text survives only in K.  
 (()) Enclosed text survives only in W.  
 [[(())]] Enclosed text survives in both K and W but is lost in N.  
 () Enclosed text is the reading of K where the scribe is not certain about the reading. The round brackets are used in the manuscript itself.  
 ⊗ Ornamental signs in manuscripts written before or after colophons.

conj.	conjecture	em.	emendation
ac	before correction	pc	after correction
f.	folio	cf.	conferatur
r	recto	v	verso
om.	omit(s)	Ex conj.	based on conjecture
m.c.	<i>metri causa</i> (=as dictated by metre)		

## Sigla of the Manuscripts and the Edition Used

- N National Archives, Kathmandu, NGMPP reel number is A 41/14, the NAK accession number is 1-277 and the size of the manuscript is 50 cm x 4 cm. The manuscript consists of 114 folios written in the Nepalese “Licchavi” script. Although the manuscript is not dated, on the basis of paleographic evidence we can assign it, with a reasonable margin of error, to 850–900 CE. Both the recto and verso sides contain six (occasionally five) lines.
- W Wellcome Institute, London: Wellcome Institute Sanskrit MS number I. 33, Devanagari script, 114 folios. This apograph is dated *vikramasamvat* 1969, which corresponds to 1912 CE. Both the recto and verso sides contain five to six lines.
- K National Archives, Kathmandu, NGMPP reel number A 159/18, NAK accession number 5-2406. The text is written in Devanagari script on 114 folios of 49 cm x 13 cm in size. Both the recto and verso sides contain six to ten lines. The recto side of folio 104 is blank. This apograph is dated to Vikrama *samvat* 1982 (1925 CE).
- T Apograph from the Tucci collection in Italy. It is written in Devanāgarī script. The MS number is 3:7:1 and the folio size is 48.5 cm x 9.5 cm. There are 94 folios, of which 1, 4, 5 and 98–104 are missing. Both the recto and verso sides usually contain five to six lines. We have not used this apograph as it contains many scribal errors.